

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

4281.9
V59
Cof. 2

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRIC. LIBRARY
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

SEP 8 1965

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRIC. LIBRARY
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

JUN 28 1965

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

1965

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

* * * * *

		ACP
		CRP
		FGP
		LFP
CD		
CCC		
CCP		
WOOL		

* * * * *

April 21 - 22, 1965

HOTEL VERMONT

BURLINGTON, VERMONT

REPORT OF STATE ASCS CONFERENCE

Vermont State and County Committeemen, County Office Managers,
County Agents, and Guests

Held at Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, April 21 and 22, 1965

Foreword

This report presents the highlights of the talks and actions taken at the 1965 State ASCS Conference. This, our 27th conference of county committeemen and county office managers, was held to discuss some of the changes which have taken place in ASCS programs over the years. These changes have been made to meet changing conditions in agriculture. Ways and means of doing a better job and to help make a better Vermont were discussed by speakers and those attending the conference.

We were honored by the presence of John L. Daley, Lieutenant Governor of Vermont, at the conference banquet. We appreciate his taking time from a busy schedule to be with us.

We were fortunate to have the Honorable Robert T. Stafford, Vermont Member, U. S. House of Representatives speak at the opening day's session.

We were also fortunate to have Charles M. Cox, Assistant Deputy Administrator, State and County Operations, ASCS, of Washington, as guest speaker at the banquet.

The conference sessions and the banquet were well attended by county committeemen, county office managers and persons representing the various cooperating agencies.

We appreciate very much the work and wholehearted cooperation of everyone who helped in any way to make our 1965 State ASCS Conference a success.

State ASC Committee

Richard A. Moore, Chairman
J. Paul Bonneau, Member
Morris E. LaFrance, Member
Robert P. Davison, Ex Officio

State ASCS Office

A. F. Heald, State Executive Director
George T. Hart, Fieldman
Emery E. Gifford, Jr., Fieldman

* * * * *

Productive soil, adequate water, and well-managed woodland are the very foundation of American agriculture. The Agricultural Conservation Program is the means through which all our people, including farmers, share the costs of conserving these essential national resources. This program increases the rate of application of the research, education, technical, credit, and other services of the Department of Agriculture in actual accomplishment of essential conservation work on the land.

Let all farmers, and particularly those not now carrying out sound conservation practices, use the Agricultural Conservation Program to increase conservation accomplishments on their lands.

* * * * *

PROGRAM

1965 STATE ASCS CONFERENCE

April 21 and 22, 1965

HOTEL VERMONT, BURLINGTON, VERMONT

First Day

9:00 a.m. Register, get name tags and banquet
to tickets at Conference Registration
10:00 a.m. Desk in Lobby

Conference Opened by
J. Paul Bonneau, Presiding

10:00 a.m. Conference Goals
Richard A. Moore,
Chairman, State
ASC Committee

10:15 a.m. Getting the Committee
Job Done
Gardner Smith
Staff Assistant,
NE Area, ASCS

Questions and Answers

Milk Break

11:15 a.m. A Report from Congress
Honorable
Robert T. Stafford
Vermont Member,
U. S. House of
Representatives

11:30 a.m. Some Aspects of
Soil Sampling and
Testing
Jerry McIntosh
Extension Soil-
Plant Relationship
Specialist

Questions and Answers

12:15 p.m. Lunch

Richard A. Moore, Presiding

1:30 p.m. The Dairy Situation
Richard D. Aplin
Marketing Administrator,
Mass.-R.I. Milk
Marketing Order

Questions and Answers

Milk Break

First Day (Continued)

2:15 p.m. Serving the
Public in ASCS

Stephen Wade
Information Specialist,
NE Area, ASCS

Questions and Answers

3:00 p.m. Progress in Vermont
Under the Economic
Opportunity Act

Paul Guare, Director
State Office, ECA

Questions and Answers

3:45 p.m. Extension Recreation
Activities

John Lindsay
Outdoor Recreation
Specialist

Questions and Answers

4:30 p.m. Adjourn

CONFERENCE BANQUET

Toastmaster - Edson E. Gifford, Sr.
State Committee Alumnus

PROGRAM

Musical Selections - Miss Claire Ruegg
AFS Student from
Switzerland

Recognition of County Committeemen
and Others

Guest Speaker - Charles M. Cox
Assistant Deputy
Administrator, State
and County Operations,
ASCS

Honored Guest

Lieutenant Governor John L. Daley

Second DayMorris E. LaFrance, Presiding

9:30 a.m. Water Problems of Vermont Dairymen Raymond G. Rowley
Vermont Commissioner
of Agriculture

9:40 a.m. Current FHA Program in Vermont George Fowler
Area Supervisor,
FHA

Questions and Answers

10:10 a.m. New Challenges to ACP John Vance
Director, CLU
Division, ASCS

Questions and Answers

Milk Break

11:00 a.m. Current Defense Activities of USDA A. F. Heald
State Executive
Director

Emergency Broadcast Facilities Richard Holmes
Deputy Director,
Civil Defense

Questions and Answers

12:00 noon Lunch

Richard A. Moore, Presiding

1:30 p.m. Discussion of Vermont
ASCS Programs

A. Wheat Edson Gifford, Jr.
Fieldman

B. Wool, Feed Grain,
and County Infor-
mational Activities George T. Hart
Fieldman

C. ACP, CRP and LFP A. F. Heald
State Executive
Director

D. County Informational Meetings Richard A. Moore
Chairman, State
ASC Committee

3:45 p.m. Adjourn

CONFERENCE GOALS

By Richard A. Moore, Chairman, Vermont State ASC Committee
At the State ASCS Conference
Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont
April 21, 1965

I am very pleased to welcome you county committeemen, county office managers, and guests to the 1965 annual Vermont State ASCS Conference. Your State Executive Director, Al Heald, members of the State Office staff, and your fieldmen have put forth a lot of hard work to make this conference possible. We think that we have done our share and we hope that you will be willing to do the rest. We have heard many times that what you put into a program is what you get out of it. The record shows that we have a new county committeeman here today and that we have 151 new community committeemen. Now this is good for our program for we always need need new ideas and new blood in our organization. We are always glad to tell you county committeemen and office managers what a good job you have done. The good work that has been done with ASCS programs in Vermont proves that the committee system can work where a real effort is made to make it work.

We have just finished a series of planning meetings around the State with county and community committeemen and representatives of other agencies to recommend for improvement in ASCS programs in Vermont. We have had some hot discussions in some of these counties. I believe we have come out with good recommendations, and these will be discussed tomorrow.

The conference has been planned similar to last year's. We will have no working committees as we have had in some previous conferences. Instead it will consist of talks by well-qualified men on the subjects selected. There will be ample time for discussion following each talk. The Thursday afternoon session has been reserved for discussions on technical details of our ASCS programs.

We are proud of our fine record of participation in ACP. Our State again leads the Nation in the percentage of cropland participating in ACP with 69%, the highest percentage of any State in the Nation. Credit for making this fine record goes to the good work of our county and community committeemen in every county in the State.

The record of the committee system in Vermont has been excellent and it was accomplished by our interested, hard-working county and community committeemen. We have done our best to offer the best kind of a program for this year's conference and I hope that you people will find that it will be beneficial, informative, and be of help to you in your work with ASCS and that you will return to your counties a better informed, more enthusiastic ASCS supporter.

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

GETTING THE COMMITTEE JOB DONE

Excerpts from Address by Gardner Smith
Staff Assistant, NE Area, ASCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

We should take a look at the basic principles and fundamentals which are pertinent to getting the committee job done. We should ask ourselves whether or not the committee system is really needed to get the job done. The special committee, appointed by Secretary Freeman, to study the committee system has reaffirmed the belief that the committee system is the best possible way of administering farm programs at the State and local level. I believe that the concept of local control and adaptation of farm programs to meet local need is as essential today as it was three years ago, or ten years ago, or even 30 years ago. We cannot operate effectively without the local judgment given by local people on these committees.

During the recent destructive tornadoes which have struck the Midwest, county committees in Michigan immediately met to assess the damage wreaked by these tremendous winds. Reports were sent into Washington on Monday morning indicating that over 1,000 farmsteads were completely destroyed. Feed inventories had been wiped out. Over 100,000 head of cattle were killed, injured or missing. Over 90,000 other head of livestock were killed, injured or missing. Over \$50 million worth of damage to farms and farm property was reported. By Tuesday preliminary plans were worked out to supply feed to the area. After President Johnson flew over the area on Wednesday these areas were declared disaster areas and assistance was on the way. The work that committees in this area did during this disaster is a remarkable illustration of the adaptability of the committee system to meet new and quickly changing situations in the field.

The farmer committee system has proved itself equal to the job for over 40 years. The record has shown very little of maladministration, fraud, or dishonesty over this long period of time. Despite the decrease in the number of farms, the committee system remains the primary organization for action at the local level. The system is democratic; it is an example of representative Government in action.

However, as much as we may believe in the committee system its effectiveness depends upon the local people. Despite automation, human hands and human brains are still required to administer farm programs. Committeemen must make the day-to-day decisions that affect farmers. These decisions are based on the committeeman's knowledge, experience, and judgment. When you were elected to the county committee an added responsibility was placed on your shoulders. You are responsible for the image of the Department of Agriculture in your locality. You should keep yourself fully informed about agriculture in your county, your community, your State and in the Nation. You should know what is going on in ASCS and know the details of the programs you work with. The action that you take as a county committeeman is going to affect someone vitally. ASCS is a large agency and thousands of decisions are made each day. It is the sum total of these decisions which form the basis of success or the lack of it in our farm programs.

There are other responsibilities which I would like to mention. You should set policies that adapt our programs to county conditions and needs within the latitude of the law. Wherever possible, the National policy will be adapted to meet local needs. At all times committeemen should try to give fair and equitable treatment to all farmers who need help. Your responsibility extends both to the farmers you serve and to the law which establishes the farm programs that you administer.

Following are some of the things that our full-time office employees, including the county office managers and clerks, can do to improve our organization and administration:

1. Make periodic reviews of county operations. Select one specific job at a time, analyze the way it is done, question every detail, improve and simplify the method of handling the job.
2. County offices are communication centers. We spend a considerable amount of time interpreting instructions to farmers and to the public. Good communications will develop good public relations. We can transmit clear ideas only when we have the problems clearly in mind and the solutions to those problems clearly envisioned. We should do all we can to improve our ability to communicate.
3. Develop the ability to train your people in practical job skills. Management skills can be learned and our people should be equipped with the basic skills that they need to carry out the job. Adequate training should be afforded to county office personnel. Training is one of the major functions of a county office manager.
4. Make your office a place of service. You county people form the base of the triangle upon which our farm programs rest. You contact farmers in the operation of programs. We are a service organization. In order to operate satisfactorily, we should operate with the fact that we are a service organization in mind. We have a monopoly and exclusive control of ASCS programs. Because we have this monopoly, we have a responsibility to give the best possible service in each county office. The county office should reflect a friendly attitude in serving farmers. Each visitor to the office should be treated as a guest and every effort should be made to provide him with complete and efficient service.

A REPORT FROM CONGRESS

Address by Honorable Robert T. Stafford
Vermont Member, U. S. House of Representatives
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

Mr. Chairman, officers of the conference, and Vermonters who are members of the conference, and some of our visitors from outside of the State and from Washington. It's a real pleasure for me to be here and to have this chance to exchange a few views with you. When I was told about this meeting and very graciously offered an invitation to stop by, I then began to think what I should talk about. Somebody suggested that since so recently, on April 15, we had all been taken over the coals by the members of the second oldest profession in the world, I guess I should say tax collectors, or maybe I should talk about something light, like how to give mouth-to-mouth resuscitation without becoming emotionally involved.

But in the very brief time I expect to take what I really want to do is pay my respects to the farm community of Vermont which leads the Nation in using the Agricultural Conservation Program and say to you that, with all of the money that I have watched spent in Washington on other farm programs that basically affect other parts of the country, I certainly can enthusiastically work as your representative down there to see that the necessary funds in the full amount are made available for the Agricultural Conservation Program and its technical services in the budget coming up for fiscal 1966.

Just before I left Washington I had a few minutes with a member of the staff of the Agricultural Committee. You may already know this more than I do but he gave me a resumé of the administration's farm legislation which will be coming out of the House Committee on Agriculture at some time, some unpredictable time, in the near future. As I understand it, we can expect the administration's bill will call for a two-year extension of the present wheat price production controls and subsidy system. We can also expect a two-year extension of the feed grain price production and subsidy system with an innovation encouraging the diversion of feed grain acreage to the growing of soybeans and permitting a feed grain producer to divert acreage to soybean production and still qualify for price production on diverted lands from the feed grains. Another innovation of the farm program will probably call for placing the rice crop under the same price production controls and subsidy systems now affecting wheat. Another part of the administration's proposal will be cropland adjustment, with provisions for retirement of land from present farm production with encouragement for putting the whole farm out of production and into either timber-growing or conservation practices or recreation. I can report to you that as of last weekend the administration's farm package did not contain any recommendations with respect to the dairy industry and it did not contain, and this is particularly important to you, any legislation to establish a revolving fund in the sum of \$20,000,000 from which to pay for certain soil conservation technical services. And I'm advised that as of last weekend the administration was having great difficulty in trying to find anybody who would sponsor that particular piece of legislation which I think may be pretty good news to the farm community here in the State of Vermont.

Now, I've gone over your program that Al graciously sent down to me and I see that you have experts who are going to talk to you on about every important aspect of agriculture that is of particular interest to you. Since in the first place I'm no expert, and in the second place, you're going to be talked to by the experts, I'm going to devote the rest of my time to a very brief discussion of two major pieces of legislation which are not particular to the farm economy but are applicable to us all as Vermonters and to us all as Americans.

Congressman Stafford then discussed in detail the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and a new medicare bill now before Congress. The question period and discussion were held after his talk.

SOME ASPECTS OF SOIL SAMPLING AND TESTING

Address by Jerry McIntosh, Extension Soil-
Plant Relationship Specialist
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

Soil is more than just a material in which plants can sink their roots and obtain mechanical support. The composition of the soil air as well as the amounts of water and essential nutrient elements in soils greatly affect the growth of plants.

Man can do very little to change the physical properties of soils. There is no practical way of changing a heavy clay soil into a loam or sandy soil. Nor can one change a sandy soil into a clay. But man can do a lot to change the chemical composition of soils. By growing crops continuously on a field for many years, the nutrients in the soil are gradually removed. On the other hand, fertilizers can change an extremely poor soil into one that is highly productive. Thus, soils are different. How can these differences be known without soil tests?

Soils are inherently different. For example, if a Vergennes clay soil from the Champlain Valley were compared with a Colrain silt loam soil from the central part of Vermont, we would see a striking contrast. They would look different, feel different and if one should happen to taste them, they would taste different. They differ chemically and would respond differently to lime, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium. The following table shows how the total amounts of potassium, magnesium, and phosphorus may differ in some Vermont soils.

TOTAL ANALYSIS OF FOUR VERMONT SOILS

<u>Soil Type</u>	<u>Potassium lbs/Acre</u>	<u>Magnesium lbs/Acre</u>	<u>Phosphorus lbs/Acre</u>
Vergennes clay	40,000	20,000	1,100
Colrain fine sandy loam	9,000	15,000	1,400
Hadley very fine sandy loam	5,000	16,000	1,700
Windsor fine sand	2,500	5,000	2,300

These inherent differences among soils are very important and have been recognized for many years. Soil surveys are based upon these differences. Nevertheless, soils which may have been alike once may no longer be alike.

Soils differ because of the way they have been cropped. Two fields may have soils which are inherently the same and have the same soil type name and still differ greatly as media in which plants can grow. Suppose one field has been used as a meadow continuously for 50 years while the other has been used as a pasture. The amounts of available potassium in these two soils could differ greatly. Three tons of hay removed from the meadow per year would also remove about 120 pounds of potassium. This would amount to a removal of about 6,000 pounds of potassium in 50 years. On the other hand, the pasture would probably have had little potassium removed from it. Although this example may be extreme, it illustrates why soils may differ even though they were inherently the same.

Soils differ because of the way they have been fertilized. Perhaps the most beneficial practice of the ACP has been the use of superphosphate with manure. It has contributed significantly to agriculture in Vermont and is still most useful. However, over the years farmers have tended to put manure on the same fields or the same rotation of fields. Again, this is a good practice, but it has resulted in an unusual build-up of phosphorus in some fields. Unfortunately, much of this phosphorus is not nearly as available to plants as it should because it has been added to acid soils.

A low rate of application of manure per acre might be 10 tons each year. If 40 pounds of superphosphate were added to each ton of manure, this would amount to an application of approximately 80 pounds of phosphate per acre. Three tons of hay would remove no more than 30 pounds of phosphate. Since phosphate rarely leaches from soil, the remainder would simply accumulate at the rate of 50 pounds per year. It is easy to see how 1500 pounds of phosphate could have accumulated in certain fields over the last 30 years and how soils may differ because of the way they have been fertilized. Remember, these figures represent a low rate of application of manure and completely disregard phosphate applied at time of seeding and topdressing. The accumulated phosphate could easily amount to 5,000 pounds.

What is a soil test? A soil test is a chemical measurement of the fertility status of a soil. It is more than a pH measurement and is not an analysis for the total amounts of nutrient elements in soil. It is a measurement of available nutrients.

Soil tests are not all alike. Tests designed in the Midwest or South may not be applicable to Vermont conditions. Perhaps of even more importance, soil tests must be correlated with crop response. This is a tedious and time consuming job, but is most important if soil tests are to be meaningful. Most testing procedures and practically all correlation data have resulted from research by the various state experiment stations.

Each sample of soil should represent a field or area of a field which a farmer intends to till as one unit. Each sample of soil should be a composite of at least 10 sub-samples taken throughout the field and mixed thoroughly together.

For corn and summer annuals, soil samples should be taken as early in the spring as possible. Fields in which new seedings are to be made may be sampled in late summer or fall. They should be sampled early enough to permit time for tests to be made and applications of corrective treatments of lime before seeding year.

In Vermont a soil test consists of 5 different measurements made on each sample of soil. These tests along with a brief explanation of their usefulness are given below.

pH -- is an expression of the degree of soil acidity. Although of little value in making soil testing recommendations, this test shows whether a soil needs lime and gives a general idea of the fertility level of a soil. Soil acidity has a tremendous effect on the availability of phosphorus in soils. The following chart shows how liming a particular soil increased the availability of phosphorus.

<u>Lime</u> <u>Tons/Acre</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Available Phosphorus</u> <u>Lbs/Acre</u>
0	4.6	13
1	5.2	14
2	5.9	18
4	6.5	24
8	6.8	23

Lime Requirement -- is a measurement of total soil acidity. It shows the amount of lime needed to raise soil pH to a desirable level.

Available Phosphorus -- is expressed as P_2O_5 (phosphate) and is a measure of readily available phosphorus in soil. The amount of phosphorus in soil measured by this test is likely to be increased by liming.

Reserve Phosphorus -- is expressed as P_2O_5 (phosphate) and is a measure of the less available phosphorus compounds in soil. Although much of this phosphorus is not readily available, this test shows the phosphorus build-up in soil and the amounts of reserve which plants may draw upon. Soils testing 100 pounds and above need no further basic applications of phosphorus. However, starter phosphorus may still be needed.

Potassium -- is expressed as K_2O (potash) and is a measure of water soluble and exchangeable forms of potassium in soil. These forms serve as the principal source of available potassium to plants within a growing season.

Conclusion. Soil testing is a good conservation practice.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

Address by Richard D. Aplin, Marketing Administrator,
Massachusetts-Rhode Island Milk Marketing Order
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

I am very pleased to meet with you people in the ASCS program. This is a good place to meet, also this is a place for many pleasant memories for me. The last time I was here was last June at a class reunion. This is a beautiful spot. I was asked this noon why it is that county agents and ex-county agents are always the ones that do the heckling at the meetings. I think it is because they have to get back - they have been heckled themselves so much over their careers.

Most of the program here today and tomorrow and the programs with which you people work have to do with production problems of Agriculture, which in Vermont, of course, are very largely directed toward the production of milk as the product to be marketed. I think it is well for the people in production to know the marketing situation and problems and for the people in the marketing part of the field to know the problems connected with the production of the product.

Vermont produces more milk than any other State in New England by far. The markets are now principally outside the State. Vermont markets a higher percent of its milk production outside the State--about 90% of it--bigger than any other State in the Union because of heavy production here and relatively small markets within the State. The milk is marketed almost entirely within New England and this last year 4 of the 5 marketing orders in New England markets were merged into one order and we now have one marketing area which until last October was 4 marketing areas. Total population of New England according to the last census was about 11,200,000 people and at that time about 1/4 of them lived in what was then the Greater Boston Marketing area or about 1/4 of the population of New England. The other 3 marketing areas that were merged with the Boston area were known as the Southeast New England area which included all of Rhode Island, Southeast Massachusetts, the Springfield market and the Worcester market, and those 3 combined also have about 1/4 of the population of New England so that the present marketing area for which I am somewhat responsible is known as the Massachusetts-Rhode Island marketing area and contains 1/2 of the population of New England.

There is a Federal milk marketing order for the Connecticut area, the marketing area being the State of Connecticut. It has about 1/4 of the population of New England and of course, the remaining 1/4 of the population is in the three Northern New England States and those cities and towns in Massachusetts which are not in the Massachusetts-Rhode Island marketing area. This makes it a very large marketing area - the 4th largest one in the country. The receipts of milk from producers for this Massachusetts-Rhode Island market are now currently about 10 million pounds of milk a day. That is 120,000 cans if you wish to measure milk by cans -- about 120,000 cans a day. We put out a press release about twice a month commenting on the market facts and on changes in the volume of receipts indicating whether production is up or down and it's usually up from the

preceding year in the same month. So when we indicate an increase of 1% in receipts of milk from last year in the same month, it means an increase of about 100,000 pounds of milk a day or about 1200 cans of milk a day.

The Connecticut pool is somewhat less than half as big and then, of course, there is the milk that comes into the unregulated markets. The number of dairy farmers, of course, has been shrinking. If these 4 markets had been combined in early 1961, there would have been 13,900 producers supplying the market but when they were actually combined last fall there were about 10,500 and in February there were 10,225. The number of dairy farmers supplying these four markets has been dropping in the last four years at the rate of about 8% a year. There are about 8% fewer farmers than the year before. So the production on the farm, of course, of those remaining is going up and in February of this year -- we don't have the marketing figures complete yet -- but in February the average amount received from each farm that did supply the milk market was 880 pounds a day. That would be somewhat over 10 cans of milk apiece on the average if farmers were still delivering in cans. Actually, about close to 90% of the milk for the market comes from producers with bulk tanks but last year it was 792 pounds. We had about 800 more producers in February of last year but they made 88 pounds of milk less on the average -- one can less per farmer than they are making this year in February. Of course, the ones that dropped out tended to be relatively small producers for the most part.

To go back four years the average receipts per farm were approximately 600 pounds in February. So we have gone from 600 pounds to 880 pounds a day of those producers in 4 years. The rate of increase for deliveries per farm since 1961 has gone up about 9% a year so that the combination of 8% fewer producers and 9% more milk has given us about 1% more milk in total receipts in the production for the market going up very slightly each year.

The rate at which producers have been dropping out of the market and in which the production of farms has been going up -- these rates have been accelerating. Through the 1950's in the Boston market the average decrease was about 5% a year in the number of producers and 7% gain in production per farm and about 2% more total milk each year. In the 1960's instead of going down 5% a year it has been going down about 8% a year in number of producers and production per farm going up about 9% rather than 7% a year. Just this winter the increase has been greater than normal. Since last November the receipts have been running about 3 to 4% ahead of a year ago but we don't think that will continue after this month. There is something about a drought of the type that we had last year that tends to increase production the following winter. That is just the opposite of what most people think, but when you have bad weather as we had last year in June and July you get a higher quality roughage hay crop and grain has been fed here more heavily than ever this winter, and the production probably will be slightly higher this winter -- at a higher cost probably -- but also slightly greater production than we have had normally. Now this 10 million pounds of milk a day coming from producers for the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market presently is Class I sales for the sale of fluid milk of about 6 million pounds a day or about 60% of the receipts on an annual average.

The sales tend to be fairly constant through the year and the 10 million pounds consist of somewhat higher production than that of April through July and somewhat under during the fall and winter. The sales run about 6 million pounds a day from this Massachusetts-Rhode Island pool. Not quite all of their sales are in the Massachusetts-Rhode Island marketing area because we do supply some milk to Connecticut and a little milk to unregulated markets outside. And the Class I sales from what is now the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market have also been coming upward about 1% a year. In the last 4 years just about the same rate that the receipts from producers have been rising and that 1% increase in sales each year is just slightly more than the increase in the population -- not very much, so that we have maintained this ratio of about 60% if we take the figures for the 4 markets that were combined and combine them, the statistics back to 1960, we have had about 50% milk in Class I in each of the last 4 years.

The number of handlers, and we call them handlers or milk dealers including cooperatives, is declining about as fast as the number of producers. Over the last 25 years it has declined faster. In 4 years the number of dealers has gone down about 8% a year. We now have only about 50 in what we call country plants supplying the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market -- about 50 plants in the country that are packaging plants. We used to have somewhat over 100 in the Boston market -- we now have 50 for the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market and we have about 160 in what we call the city plants in which milk is received from producers. Many of these are very small but there are 160 that receive milk directly from producers and 50 in the country that receive milk directly from producers. But, of course, most of the country plants are primarily for receiving the milk from producers and either shipping it to the market as fluid milk or manufacturing it and so these 50 country plants receive 64% of the milk and the larger number of city plants, some of which are small, receive the other 36%. One of the interesting things about it, I think, is that of this 36% of the milk received at the city bottling plants directly from farmers 7% is from producers more than 100 miles from the plant. There has been some significant increase in the volume of milk hauled from producers more than 100 miles away from the plant. As you know, some handlers are coming up here even into Northern Vermont from Massachusetts receiving direct from producers. Roxbury is an example on the Western side of the State and Deary Brothers on the Eastern side.

Vermont is by far the principal State supplying milk in this Massachusetts-Rhode Island market. About 1/2 of the total milk in the Massachusetts-Rhode Island pool is produced in the State of Vermont leaving the other half to be produced in 6 other states -- Massachusetts producing 18%; Eastern New York 12%; Maine 7%; New Hampshire 6%, Connecticut 4%; and Rhode Island 3%. None of those other states produce 1/3 as much for this market as does Vermont. Addison County is now the principal county supplying milk. It has passed Franklin and Orleans in the quantity of milk supplied to Southern New England. I knew, when they got a good county agent down there and improved production practices, they would really move ahead and they have, of course. Franklin is second and Orleans County is third.

Now as far as prices go, of course, the objective of this Federal milk marketing program is to establish minimum prices to producers for milk. You don't regulate prices in which dealers sell milk to each other or to consumers but we do establish minimum prices that handlers are required to pay producers for the milk and in this market in recent years hardly anybody paid more than the minimum price. A few of the cooperatives are making earnings that enable them to pay slightly above the minimum price but in general the price to farmers is the minimum price. But, as you know, I'm not going into the classified price plan, because I assume that you understand that, but I am just touching the high spots. But the prices for milk have been remarkably steady. For some farmers they have probably seemed annoyingly steady for the past 10 years or more like the wholesale commodity price index which is one of the factors that we used in the Class I price formula. That has changed hardly at all in the past 10 years and neither has the price of milk changed hardly at all in 10 years. It has gone up a little and down a little but it is about the same as it was 10 years ago and it has been about the same all the time in between. We are now announcing our prices on the basis of 3.5% milk. We always did until last October announce them for 3.7. It doesn't make any difference for either 3.7 milk or 3.5 milk but to make our price announcements like other markets in the country we announce a basic price for 3.5 milk. With a butterfat differential of about 7¢ a point it simply means that we are announcing a 3.5 milk basic price which if we announced for 3.7 milk would be 14¢ higher.

On the basis of 3.5 milk the price is expected to average this year about \$4.45 to the producer up here in the 201-210 zone from Boston which is the center of the milkshed and which is about the cost of North Central Vermont. This remains about that level -- about \$4.50 for 3.5 milk for 10 years or more. The Class I price has remained about constant. That has averaged about \$1.00 above the blend or the blend has been \$1.00 under Class I which has been about \$5.45 with Class II milk most of the time around \$3.10 as annual average. Now these prices are influenced and our formula that the chairman spoke about for establishing prices does take into account what the supply of milk is and the butter price is affected in two ways by what the supply of milk is for this market relative to the sales of Class I milk in this market because the supply and demand relationship affects the Class I price and then, of course, it affects what percentage of the milk is sold in Class I and each has an effect on the blend so that it has turned out that this price of about \$4.45 for 3.5 milk in the last 10 years seems to be as high as the market can maintain. For each producer is free to market whatever volume of milk whether he is dictated either by his desires or his capabilities or the resources that he can command to produce milk. Also his decision as to whether to keep on producing milk or not. And with free entry of producers into the market from other markets or free entry into the dairy business if they want to come in, although not many have done that, there has been an extensive entry of producers into the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market from the New York-New Jersey market. This has been going on for 30 years. Because, I remember in 1932, the last year before I went down to Boston to work on milk marketing, all of the milk produced in Western Vermont, south of Burlington that was not consumed locally, was marketed in the New York market except for the single plant at Shoreham. That was the only

plant south of Burlington on the west side of the Green Mountains whose milk did not go into the New York market in 1932. Even Shelburne Cooperative was shipping that year. In 30 years then this has shifted so that every plant south of Burlington ships into the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market area except the one at Fair Haven. So it has shifted from everyone being in New York but one to everyone being in the New England market except one. And, of course, substantial quantities of milk are now received in the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market from Eastern New York.

A very large share of all the milk in Washington County, New York, which is an important dairy county, comes into the New England market now and I was at a meeting there with the Farm Bureau Dairy Committee a few years ago and Bob Story of Cornell, who used to be here, told the Committee that within 10 years all of the milk in Washington County, New York would be marketed in New England and that it is moving in that direction. So then, we have a free entry of producers into this market if the price is more favorable to them in this market than any other market that they have available and if the production of milk is, they think, better to them than producing some other product on the farms and the quantity that they can market has not been restricted except by restrictions that fall on them because of inability to get working capital or other resources to produce milk. It is influenced by their inability to go into some other line of activity. So price has been the only factor that has regulated production in this market.

Heald - Are you going to comment on inspection - is it a problem or not?

Aplin - Well, one of the problems the farmer has to meet is inspection standards that will influence whether he will stay in business or not.

Heald - I mean the New York area. You say there are no restrictions. Is inspection a restriction?

Aplin - Well, they have to meet the Massachusetts inspection. A producer in New York State cannot ship into the Boston, Massachusetts market until he meets the Massachusetts inspection which is the same as up here. There is one group of producers around Smith Basin which is near Glens Falls which was hoping to start shipping in last Thursday but they didn't get their inspection all done and will probably start shipping this week. But as long as they meet the same inspection, they can ship. As a matter of fact, the level of the milk price in the New York-New Jersey market which is the largest market in the country has been the limiting factor for years on how high the price of milk can be in the New England markets, because of the proximity of the New York-New Jersey market, the size of it and the ability of producers to shift to this market if the price is more favorable here. As we have seen, the entire west side of Vermont shifted during the last 30 years and in Eastern New York more have shifted in recent years.

Producers shift if the blended price is higher. If the blended price is persistently higher in Massachusetts-Rhode Island than New York-New Jersey, individual producers who are in a position to from their location or other

means tend to shift over to this market. These meet inspection, etc. They would have a farm tank to ship to any plants that are located so that they can take the milk and New York is one of the markets that has only 40% of their milk in farm tanks, yet every other Federal order market in the country has at least 75% of their milk in farm tanks and we have in our market up to 90%.

Our blended price for 3.5 milk has averaged about 17¢ over the New York-New Jersey blended price for the last 6 years. It has averaged about 17¢ for 6 years. Now, that is partly offset currently in the cost to milk producers and those are the only ones that can shift because our plants located here and in New York will not accept the milk in cans. That is partly offset by the fact that there is not currently any hauling charge on bulk milk in New York markets and there is in ours. Our hauling charges average about 15½ cents in country plants. So that, to some extent, offsets the average difference of 17¢ for the last 6 years. There has been a rather steady flow in this group of 30 producers down in Smith Basin which is probably shifting this week to the Massachusetts-Rhode Island market -- not because we need the milk -- we have plenty of milk, but because our prices are just a little bit more favorable to them than New York-New Jersey prices. On the other hand, there are at least 25 to 30 producers that are going to shift from Massachusetts-Rhode Island into Connecticut by the first of July because the Connecticut blend is averaging about a dime above ours. I expect it to average about a dime higher and that's enough to shift some of these producers in the Eastern Connecticut market from the Rhode Island market to the Connecticut market. Our Class I price is likewise a little higher than New York's for the last 6 years -- about 25¢ higher the last 2 years, and that is enough to cause some of our dealers to carefully consider why they would not be better off to buy the milk from New York pooling plants. This is the factor that limits our price -- the availability of other milk and other producers nearby who will come into this market in substantially larger numbers if our prices increase relative to New York prices. If the New York price moves up, our price can move up to the same extent. Whether or not that would stimulate production among the present producers, I do not know but any high price here without a corresponding increase in the New York-New Jersey price would certainly bring in additional milk which, of course, would serve to dilute our blend and we would not have 60% Class I.

Al has asked me to speak about the dairy support price program. The USDA has several programs that tend to aid in dairy marketing in the United States besides the Federal Milk Order Program. One of them is the dairy support price program, under which the U. S. Department of Agriculture for years has tried to maintain a floor under prices for milk used in manufacturing by offering to buy at given prices all the butter, cheddar cheese and nonfat dry milk that is offered and that is what maintains the market at that price. The marketing year is from April 1 to March 31 and under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture is required to support the price of milk for manufacturing at 75% of parity. Now, hardly anybody knows any longer how to figure parity but he does or somebody down there at the Department does and 75% of parity is the level which has been supported for the last few years. That is the minimum at which it can be supported. The parity index, index of items which farmers buy, has gone up a little

bit from a year ago, although the price support level for this marketing year which just started April 1 is 75% of parity, the same as last year, the actual support price is \$3.24 whereas it was \$3.15 for last year. That is \$3.24 for milk of average test in the country and the average test of milk in the country has been going down. It used to be fairly close to 4% and in order to maintain these slightly higher prices the purchase price for butter was raised 1¢ a pound and for cheddar cheese $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ a pound and no change in the price of nonfat dry milk. Actually the market price some of the time last year ran above the support level. That was true from September through December when the butter market tightened up to the extent that the New York butter price was as much as 4¢ a pound over the support level. Then the dairy price of milk used in manufacturing, including our Class II price, rose accordingly.

There are two changes in the purchase program this year for butter that Al has asked me to speak about and they are of some interest particularly here in Vermont. The first one was that after May 1 of this year the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the buying agency for the USDA, will buy in New England and New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey - these 9 states, only bulk butter which has been produced here. There will have to be some evidence that the butter they buy in these 9 Northeastern States was produced in these States. They will not buy butter here which was produced outside this area. They will buy it where it was produced but not here. This was intended to discourage an excessive movement of Midwestern butter to the East. Purchases in New York by the Commodity Credit Corporation have been so heavy as to exceed utilization they can make of the butter and some of it had to be shipped back to the West and there is, of course, a loss in transportation.

Then there is another item which is of particular interest here in Burlington -- in Vermont. The butter purchase price in New England this year will be on the same basis as it has been in other recent years in New York State, Pennsylvania and other States in the Northeast and Midwest. In other words, the purchase price for butter at any particular point in New England will be the New York City support price minus 80% of the rail freight to New York. Up to April 1, the CCC will purchase butter at any point in New England at the New York City price. This had the effect of causing a lot of butter to be shipped into Burlington from Northern New York to be offered to the Government in Burlington. Now if it were offered to the Government in Northern New York, the price would have been the New York City support price minus 80% of the rail freight to New York but if it were offered to the Government in Burlington, it was at the New York City price. This tended to price this butter out of the commercial market. It made it more profitable to sell it to the Government at Burlington than to market it commercially because you couldn't sell butter to commercial buyers in Northern New York at the New York City price but you could sell it to the Government in Burlington at the New York City price. This caused some of this butter -- New England butter -- to be priced out of the commercial market because it was more profitable to sell it to the Commodity Credit Corporation. So that, beginning April 1, any butter offered to the Government anywhere in Vermont for example, the price they pay will be the New York purchase price minus 80% of the freight from New York. There was a Federal discussion about this

in which Senator Aiken took an active part. So I want to go into this a bit more. Actually, this doesn't lower price for butter in Burlington on April 1. It raised it a little because the purchase price at New York City the last marketing year was 58.75 cents for Grade A butter and the Government raised the purchase price generally a cent a pound which made the New York City butter price 59.75 cents. The rail freight from Burlington to New York is 59¢ on 100 pounds of butter or 59 hundredths of a cent a pound of butter and 80% of 59 hundredths is about 47 hundredths of a cent so the purchase price here in Burlington is the higher New York support price of 59.75 cents a pound minus about 1/2 cent. That makes it about 59.25 cents. The result would be that less butter would be handled in Burlington. The Champlain Valley Fruit Company has a big storage here for handling butter.

Now the USDA has a few other programs influencing the marketing of milk and prices besides this one. There is a special milk program, the school lunch program, and a program called military and Veterans Hospital program, which subsidize some of the milk used in those installations. Outlets provided by them took about the equivalent of 8 billion pounds of milk last year or about 6% or so of the National production. Then there are the programs of food distribution to needy persons on welfare which include some milk products and the Food Stamp Plan which is coming into use in additional parts of the country. And efforts are being made to increase foreign outlets for milk products with some success in the last two years.

The last part I want to mention, which Al asked me to discuss, are possible substitutes for fresh milk. Back in the days of the depression in the 1930's evaporated milk was considered to be a competitor of fresh milk. It was to some extent, but in recent years the production of evaporated milk has been steadily declining in the country and it is no longer considered much of a competitor to fresh milk. Of course, some people use it in cooking. Nonfat dry milk has been increasing in production greatly because of conversion of farms in some parts of the country from farm-separated cream to whole milk. It has been a problem on how to market all the nonfat dry milk and we see in the National magazines some companies advertising Carnation and Pet and other companies promoting nonfat dry milk for drinking and for cooking and also for other uses. Apparently, it is not replacing fresh milk to any significant degree. It is getting some additional solids consumed.

There have been some developments in producing sterile, whole milk; putting it in medically sealed cans in a sterile condition so it will keep without refrigeration for months. But this is produced so far principally for use in areas where fresh milk is not available except at prohibitive or high cost. There doesn't seem to be much advantage if fresh milk is available at a reasonable price to use sterile whole milk because there is no saving of transportation. You still have to transport the whole milk. You don't have to refrigerate it but you have to transport it in cans and it is just as expensive as fresh milk in tank trucks. It has a higher processing and container cost but a lower distributing cost but not much gain in cost.

The products that the industry feels were any threat to whole milk - fresh milk - are the milk concentrates -- either fresh concentrated milk, frozen concentrated milk or sterile concentrated milk. Now all of these have been produced experimentally in the country and are fairly acceptable products. The big difficulty was getting the concentrate so that if you put water with it it would taste the same as fresh milk. I don't think that they do yet but some people think that they do and they come an awful lot closer to it than they used to. And, of course, if you think of transporting milk from the Midwest to the Eastern market such as these in New England the cost makes it fairly expensive when it gets here -- about equal to our Class I price. But if you remove $\frac{2}{3}$ of the water, then you cut down the transportation cost very greatly. Probably, it would be either frozen or sterile concentrate if it were shipped in from the Midwest. You can have a frozen milk concentrate about like the frozen orange concentrate we are accustomed to that would be a fairly acceptable product when it is reconstituted with water the same as orange concentrate is. Or you don't need to have it frozen; you can simply have it sterile. It would be like evaporated milk except that it would have a good flavor. Or you can make it as fresh concentrate, put it in and sell it in milk bottles in concentrated form and let the consumer put two bottles of water with one bottle of milk. If it were shipped in from the West this would probably be in sterile form or frozen to keep it better. It would probably be produced in Minnesota or Wisconsin and such states and the point is that it would be made from milk that is purchased from farmers at a price about equal to our Class II price because our Class II price is based on price paid to manufacturing plants in the Midwest.

There would have to be a little higher premium. There would have to be some premium for the extra quality that will be needed in this milk because you have to have a very high quality milk to make a high quality concentrate that will taste the same as fresh milk. It has to be just as good as fresh milk would be to start with and it has to be better than a lot of the milk going into evaporated milk or nonfat dry milk. So there will be some premium above our Class II price but not too great, maybe it might be possible then to undersell fresh milk with such a product by several cents a quart. It wouldn't be possible to undersell our milk in Southern New England as much as from other markets in the East because we never lower our resale price to consumers. Relative to Class I price in most markets in the country our dealers' margins are less and have been for the last 7 years. And that makes fresh milk a stronger competitor. Their price wouldn't be as much under our price as it would have been 10 years ago because our margins are 2 or 3¢ less a quart than they were then. It would raise a very difficult question if this product came into the market on how to price our milk to keep it competitive because our plants here can make concentrated milk. Our plants not already equipped to make it can make a good product but then there would be a question as to whether we are going to charge a Class I price or Class II price or something in between. If we charge them Class I price, they could not compete with the Western concentrates. If we charge them something above the Class II price but not too far above, they could.

Now, the Boston market was one of the markets picked to be a test market in 1951 by Sealtest on fresh concentrated milk and at that time we amended our order to make milk put into fresh concentrate Class I, and the concentrate was offered to consumers in Boston at a savings of about $2\frac{1}{2}\phi$ a quart of milk from fresh milk and it didn't go over. Consumers didn't buy it at $2\frac{1}{2}\phi$ a quart difference. It has to be more than $2\frac{1}{2}\phi$ a quart difference apparently.

Some people think we are going to have competition from these concentrated milks. This is a problem with which we are going to have to deal in the future. I don't know how to tell you how we are going to solve it because I don't know. But in milk marketing, the same as in milk production, you keep getting new problems and I guess the best you can do is try to figure out when they arrive what to do about them and if you can't head some of them off. I don't know. This will be a problem that will bother us. Some people say that it's just around the corner. Professor Bartlett of the University of Illinois has been saying that for 20 years. Just around the corner. So you haven't gotten to the corner yet. So, I don't know. You better wait till we get there.

I want to thank you for the opportunity of being here.

SERVING THE PUBLIC IN ASCS

Excerpts from Address by Stephen Wade
Information Specialist, NE Area, ASCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

Good public relations and public information are necessary to the successful administration and operation of farm programs. The U. S. Department of Agriculture has an obligation to farmers and to the public at large to keep them informed of programs available and the effects of those programs. The economic effect of farm programs on the area should be brought to the attention of all the people. How farm programs affect the food supply in this country and what is being done to conserve our soil, water and wildlife resources is public information.

Here is a mythical illustration which emphasizes my point. On one side we have a country which is ill-informed and therefore backward and under-developed. On the other side is a country which has modern communications and up-to-date public information. The latter is prosperous and well-developed. This illustration points out the need for informing the farmers, the public, and others.

We should not be ashamed to tell our story. We should make every effort to cooperate with the news media such as newspapers, radio, and television. We should give them stories that are timely and interesting. We should keep in mind that the news media is not obligated to tell our story, so we must work hard to bring about good relations.

In the near future, I hope to do some feature stories about ASCS work in Vermont.

In closing I would like to say that I am particularly impressed with the fine working conditions that you ASCS people have with the Extension Service here in Vermont.

PROGRESS IN VERMONT UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Excerpts from Address by Paul Guare, Director,
State Office, Economic Opportunity Act
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

Much effort has gone into the implementation of the Economic Opportunity Act in Vermont but to date there has been little visible progress. The purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act is to set up at the community level organizations which will determine a community need and take community action to correct current problems. Local people must be involved in the planning for community action. The community action agency must have the capacity to administer the EOA program locally. Presently there are 5 community action agencies which are organized and non-profit organizations. The 5 organizations are the Northeast Kingdom Area, the Champlain Valley Area, the Central Vermont Area, the Southwest Vermont Area, and the Southeast Vermont Area. There is no qualified functioning agency in Vermont as yet. However, the Northeast Kingdom Area has submitted a development plan. However, it is hoped that there will be 5 equipped and qualified organizations within the next two months.

Title I, Part A of the Economic Opportunity Act sets up the Job Corps. The purpose of this is the training and remedial education of youths. Presently there is a Job Corps Camp being constructed in Ripton, Vermont and it is under the supervision of the U. S. Forest Service.

Part B of Title I, establishes a Neighborhood Youth Corps which is administered by the Department of Labor and it is hoped that 12 such projects will be approved in Vermont by this summer. Neighborhood Youth Corps offer in-school youngsters a chance to earn money so that it will help to keep them in school. There is also a portion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps which deals with out-of-school youths.

Part C of Title I is the work-study program and this is in operation at St. Michael's College and the University of Vermont at the present time.

Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act deals with community action programs. Under this title of the act a community that can mobilize its own resources and organize for action may qualify for community action program funds. The communities themselves must develop their own program and their own course of action to correct problems that exist in their area.

EXTENSION RECREATION ACTIVITIES

Address by John Lindsay, Outdoor Recreation Specialist
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

On June 15, 1964, the Extension Service of the University of Vermont entered into a cooperative agreement with the Federal Extension Service, USDA for exploratory work in the area of outdoor recreation on private lands. This program is one of testing and developing subject matter and the application of new methods and techniques in the area of outdoor recreation on private lands. At the present time Malcolm Bevins, Extension Economist, is project leader and I am the recreation development specialist and spend my full time in this work. We cooperate with the Federal Extension Service through Mr. Edward J. Williamson, who is Extension Conservationist. There are three important concepts in regard to outdoor recreation in Vermont:

1. That raw materials in Vermont are abundant. We have the natural resources of land, water, mountains, and wildlife to work with.
2. The present economic impact on the State is substantial and it has much bigger potential.
3. Income recreation developments on private lands is a serious business and it needs careful planning before one expends a large amount of capital in the recreation business. The objectives of the outdoor recreation project are twofold:
 1. To develop, test, and publish new methods, techniques and teaching materials in connection with outdoor recreation on private lands.
 2. To report the enterprise input-output data using the case study approach.

To meet the broad objective under 1 above, it is planned to:

- A. Study and evaluate the demand for outdoor recreation in general and for specific activities.
- B. Study and evaluate the feasibility of resource use on private lands for recreational purposes.
- C. Train leaders to carry on educational programs in outdoor recreation.
- D. Work cooperatively with other staff members and representatives of Federal and State agencies to carry on effective outdoor recreation educational work at the State and county levels.

To meet the objectives under 2 above, a study of farmers who have substituted outdoor recreation for agricultural production will be made. We will also study farms that have added outdoor recreation as a supplementary enterprise to the farm business. A study of zoning and public policy

with reference to private recreation development is planned as well as the study of the methods and techniques used in Extension outdoor recreation programs in other States including the cooperative working arrangements with other States. In most cases it is not recommended that a full-time commercial dairy farmer think too seriously of recreation as a sideline because it would not ordinarily work out too well except in rare cases where an outstandingly organized setup is arranged.

Up to the present time, there have been 87 requests for help from private land owners and over 700 people have been spoken to in regard to recreation possibilities.

THE CHALLENGE OF OUR JOB

Address by Charles M. Cox, Assistant Deputy Administrator,
State and County Operations, ASCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1965

I want to congratulate you employees who have been with us for some time for doing a good job with ACP and ASCS programs in Vermont. I want to welcome you new employees to the finest organization in the world. You can be proud of the low degree of fraud and dishonesty in ASCS and you can be proud of the high degree of efficiency.

You are well aware of the magnitude of farmer committee operations throughout the United States. Price support loans have amounted to \$21 billion from the inception of the program and the charge-off due to error, fraud or defect of any kind is less than one-tenth of 1%. ACP cost-sharing has been provided for from 1 to 3.8 million farmers annually since 1936. Terraces equal to over six times the distance to the moon and back have been built. More trees have been planted than there are people in the world. 800 million acres of grass and legumes cover have been planted with ACP cost-sharing. This is a third of the land area in this country. ASCS has administered the feed grain program and wheat stabilization program for about 1.3 million participants each year. About 40% of eligible farmers participating are on a voluntary basis. These programs save \$800,000 a day in storage and handling costs alone. ASCS people have established 3.4 million allotments for tobacco, peanuts, cotton, rice and wheat, but we cannot afford to rest on our laurels.

There is need for better operations in ASCS. The General Accounting Office, Congressional investigation, audits and investigations by the Office of the Inspector General and our own administrative reviews show the need for improvement. The goal of good administration is the honest performance of each job to the satisfaction of the people we serve at a minimum of cost. All of us want to improve but many of us are inclined to procrastinate. We are sowing the seeds of destruction when we tolerate complacency on the job. When we show resistance to change, we are also heading for trouble. If we fail to heed good advice and profit by our mistakes, we are hurting not only ourselves personally but one of the great organizations in the country today.

We face serious challenges in farming and farm programs today. The challenge of the 1950's was persistently low farm prices, sliding scale support and depressions in agriculture. From 1952 to 1960 farm prices fell 17%. Farm costs rose 17%. The challenge of the 1960's is a continuation and improvement of farm programs. "All great changes are irksome to the human mind, especially those which are attended with great dangers and uncertain effects." This is quoted from John Adams. "We must not kid ourselves, changes are coming at breakneck speed. We must be prepared to meet them or they will pass us by. In the words of James Farley, "To kid your opponent is petty larceny, to kid yourself is grand larceny."

There is a staggering revolution in the techniques of farming. Before 1945 the increase in farm productivity has outstripped the industrial increase in productivity by two times. But, as President Johnson said in his recent farm message to Congress, "The enormous advance in agricultural

efficiency has left the farmer working harder and enjoying it less." The agricultural situation is confusing. There is the paradox of tremendous research, education and conservation on one hand and over-abundance and tremendous efficiency on the other. American farmers are the most successful providers of food and fiber in our history. Half of the Nation's poverty is in the rural area and half of this in the South. The net farm income per family has been up 16% since 1960. Income per farm family is only 55% of the ^{Income of} non-farm families. Bank deposits in farm counties are up 25% in three years. Farm communities have three times the proportion of dilapidated and substandard housing as the rest of the Nation. CCC stocks are down from six billion dollars to 4.2 billion in 1964. We can conclude that while farmers are better off than four years ago, they are still at a disadvantage. We have had four years of fairly stable high income compared to the recent past. Less than one out of seven farmers enjoys a parity of income. Some of us remember back when farm programs were born with rural crisis. The price debacle of the 1930's when cotton was 5¢, cattle 10¢, wheat 30¢, corn 32¢, hogs 3¢, and I am told that milk was a dollar a hundredweight. This has been an anti-poverty program from its inception. The farm programs have provided a major role in the fight against poverty and rural decline today. Farm programs have had a big effect in Vermont. ACP with its main practice, establishment and improvement of vegetative cover, has been used on 6, 123 farms in the 1963 program year. Congratulations!

There are two dairy price programs, Federal orders in 76 markets, (Vermont is in the Boston) and New York orders which regulate the handling of fluid milk. Last year 168,000 producers delivered 54.4 billion pounds of milk to regulated handlers. This is about half of the milk delivered to all plants and dealers in the United States. It's worth about 2.4 billion dollars. Orders set forth minimum price for milk according to use. Producers receive an average or blended price. Then there is the dairy price support. This is Nationwide and benefits all farmers. The program provides for direct benefit by removing the surplus from the market. In the 1964-65 marketing year, Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 760 million pounds of nonfat dry milk, 237 million pounds of butter and 135 million pounds of cheese. The purchases in Vermont amounted to about \$9,000,000. Donations to needy charitable institutions and school lunch programs in 1964-65 used about 175 million pounds of nonfat dry milk, 160 million pounds of butter and 135 million pounds of cheese. Dairying is even more important to Vermont. Cash receipts from milk totaled \$97,000,000 or nearly 75% of the total receipts from marketing, highest of any State.

The wool program is not big in Vermont, but it is important. About 175 Vermont producers participate and payments amount to a little over \$7300. In Vermont the Feed Grain Program with 267 farms enrolled this year to divert 3400 acres is being used to good advantage.

Of course, we all know that the farm policy is controversial, there is a difference of opinion among supporters as to the kind of farm programs needed and there is too much argument over details. Some say no programs, but they offer no alternatives. The fundamental problem is resources and our ability to produce. Studies by Cornell, Iowa State, Congressional Committees, and others have documented the catastrophe that would follow in the absence of farm programs. A recent study by Walter Wilcox, Library

of Congress, shows that without price support or acreage diversion programs during the three years 1961, 1962, and 1963 net farm income would have been 6 billion dollars rather than the 12.6 billion that it was. This is a drop of more than 50 percent. The report shows further that in the absence of marketing agreements and orders, export programs authorized by Public Law 480, and the Agricultural Conservation Program there would have been an even more drastic drop in the net farm income. The Presidential message on agriculture this year reaffirms his position that no farm program would spell real disaster. There is a need to recognize that farm programs are a reflection of public policy of the American people. A better understanding of programs is necessary.

Food is a bargain. Consumers in the United States use 19% of their income to buy food; in England they use 30%; 45% in Japan; 60% in Russia. Our needy people are getting more and better food diets. Farmers, too, are good customers; they spend 40 to 43 billion dollars a year.

Greater efficiency alone is not the complete answer to the farm problem. Our public relations efforts need to be based on sound programs and stem from sincere motives. The ASCS has a heavy responsibility and it is apparent that our organization faces a heavy responsibility both now and in the future. Each program we administer is developed in response to a particular problem which individual farmers could not dodge nor hope to solve alone. Each calls for cooperative action toward a common objective. The challenge of our job is to get things done. We are all interested in getting things done. The only excuse for our existence is public service. "What is needed for public service is strong nerves, backbone, instinct for combat, the hide of a rhinoceros and the willingness to work like a dog for an occasional rainwashed bone." This was said by Robert Moses. I am convinced that the only way to get things done is by working together - working with and through other people. Good management is defined as "The art of getting effective work done by other people."

The Department has worked with Congressional and dairy leaders during the last several years to try to develop a program to improve dairy farm income without decreasing production or increasing Government purchases, and program costs. The Department has recommended several proposals involving varying degrees of supply-management, but none has been enacted. In 1963 USDA recommended legislation to authorize payment to farmers who restricted their marketings. The Senate voted it down; the House did not vote on it. The President again recommended it in his farm message a year ago, but no action was taken by Congress in 1964. In late 1963 the Senate passed legislation to authorize a Class I base plan and Federal Order Markets where producers approved it. It would divide the Class I sales among producers, provide for paying producers by users and provide that a producer could reduce his own production of lower price milk without losing his share of high price sales. The House did not vote on this legislation. The Department's position was that it might help a little, but not enough to significantly raise dairy farm income. Similar legislation has been introduced at this session of Congress and in testifying before the House Subcommittee on April 5, the Department representatives again expressed the view that such a plan for Federal Orders would probably result in some increase in National dairy farm income, but would not increase income as much as the Department would like.

There is a need for unity in agriculture. There is no longer a farm bloc. There are 300 Congressmen from urban areas, only one in three have 10% or more of rural populations. Farmers represent only about 7% of the total population. Farm organizations seem to be pulling in opposite directions. We cannot afford the luxury of disagreements over minor details. Too many try to speak for farmers.

The President has set a goal of parity of income and parity of opportunity for rural people. Let's help him achieve it! This is an exciting time in the history of farm programs, a dramatic and forward looking period in agriculture. We must carry out the programs which Congress provides with understanding, enthusiasm, and fairness. The future of agriculture depends upon you and people like you. Secretary Freeman, our Administrator, Horace Godfrey, and their associates have worked long and hard to bring about a better understanding of farm problems and to develop programs which will enable farmers to find solutions to their own and the country's problems. The problem is how to live with and use our agricultural abundance so that it will be a blessing to all mankind and at the same time not penalize the farmers of this great Nation who are responsible for it.

WATER PROBLEMS OF VERMONT DAIRYMEN

Excerpts from Talk by Raymond G. Rowley
Vermont Commissioner of Agriculture
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 22, 1965

I am glad of this opportunity to discuss briefly with you the critical water shortage in Vermont. The State Department of Agriculture has recently assigned one man to work full time on the water shortage situation in the State. This man will be available for work with the water standards necessary to meet the new Federal code. All agencies should work together to help farmers to understand and to meet the new Federal regulations concerning farm water supplies.

A meeting of dairy leaders in the State will be held on April 23. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss our problems and to determine ways and means by which the State and Federal Governments can work together to help farmers to meet the new more rigid water requirements.

CURRENT FHA PROGRAM IN VERMONT

Excerpts from Address by George Fowler,
Area Supervisor, Farmers Home Administration
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 22, 1965

I think that we in the Federal Service must always be aware that we are a community of services working for the good of the farm family and rural family to assist them in every way possible to achieve a livelihood that is on a par with their urban counterparts. Our supervisors are associated with members of your staff in working and on Civil Defense Boards, Technical Action Panels, and Rural Areas Development Committees. But somehow I have the feeling that our sister agencies are not always aware of the services that are available to rural people. I appreciate this opportunity of just reviewing what we can do and what we are doing.

1. Operating loans are made to farm families for amounts up to \$35,000. These loans are repaid over periods up to 12 years if necessary. They are made for livestock, equipment, refinancing of debts, and in some cases for real estate purposes.
2. Farm ownership loans are made to the family-type farmer for purchase of a farm, erecting buildings - and I would like to especially mention new barns here - adding land, and refinancing most short-term debts and placing them on a long-time basis. These loans are made for periods up to 40 years at 5%.
3. Rural housing loans are made primarily now to families living in rural areas, for building new homes, repairing and remodeling existing structures. These loans can be made to senior citizens to purchase homes.
4. Soil and water conservation loans are made to all types of farmers for developing water systems.
5. We have just completed about 150 emergency loans to farmers in six designated counties for feed needs, water needs, replacement of seedings, and replacement of worn-out machinery. This authority will be extended to December 31, 1965.
6. Economic Opportunity loans are now being made through our offices to assist farm families and rural families who have limited resources and income that does not meet their needs. The purpose of the loans is to increase income and improve living standards.
7. We also have available association loans to nonprofit groups in rural areas, to develop recreation areas and senior citizens' rental housing. Listed below are our offices:

William Collins, County Supervisor, 54 A Main Street, Middlebury, Vermont. He covers Addison, Bennington and Rutland Counties.

Richard A. Angney, County Supervisor, P. O. Building, Montpelier, Vermont. He covers Orange and Washington Counties.

Ralph H. May, County Supervisor, Room 10 Federal Building, Newport, Vermont. He covers Orleans, Caledonia and Essex Counties.

Sylvester T. Harvey, County Supervisor, 68 Main Street, St. Albans, Vermont. He covers Franklin, Chittenden, Grand Isle and Lamoille Counties.

William T. Haubrich, County Supervisor, 25 Mulberry Street, Claremont, New Hampshire. He covers Windsor and Windham Counties.

NEW CHALLENGES TO ACP

Address by John Vance, Director, CLU Division, ASCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 22, 1965

Morris, I have real mixed emotions in being introduced as you introduced me, although I do take a great deal of pride in having had the good fortune of being able to work with ASCS and with the farm people of this country for the better part of my adult life. As I say, I have mixed emotion at this type of introduction. To this extent, I had an experience some time back, believe it or not. I was being introduced to a group and the gentleman who introduced me went even further than your distinguished State Committeeman did in giving a detailed account of the various jobs that I held in agriculture during the past almost 30 years. It was this guy has done this, he's been this, and so forth for 5 minutes or more. Some fellow in the back of the room got up and said, "Mr., I hate to interrupt you but I want to say one thing. I don't know who you are introducing, but if I were this guy I would never let you do it again because the only thing you say to us is that this fellow can't hold a job."

Very seriously, ladies and gentlemen, I have really looked forward to this occasion. You know it's customary to tell a group you've looked forward to being with them, but I mean it, I've looked forward to meeting with you people here in Vermont and I've looked forward to this occasion for a number of very valid and legitimate reasons other than the fact I like people. I like to meet people that have the responsibility and are doing such a marvelous job running this organization. The reason that I particularly wanted to visit with you is that I wanted to talk with you and I wanted to find out, if I could, how you do such a marvelous job so far as securing and obtaining participation in ACP. This State, Al, should be recognized Nationally, and I'm sure you are but I don't think you are sufficiently, for the outstanding job that you have done in getting the farmers to understand what ACP has to offer and in successfully getting the land of this beautiful State of yours into the program.

This chart that you have here is remarkable. This is remarkable. The spread between your participation here so far as your cropland is concerned and the Nation is even wider on a numerical head-count basis than it is on the percentage of cropland. I think, Al, your participation, that is in terms of eligible farms, runs somewhere above 65% doesn't it? The Nation as a whole will run around 20% and I wanted an opportunity to personally congratulate you people here in this room who are responsible for getting this job done and I wanted an opportunity to find out how you do it. So this is one of the reasons I wanted to be here to meet with you. I think I am beginning to know after talking with some people last night. It was a very pleasant occasion. I think one key to it is the fact that you are using your community committeemen. This may be the key to it and I suspect that, of all the States that I have had the occasion to visit during the past several months or several years, Vermont, in my estimation, is the most conservation-minded ASCS organization in the Nation. And to me this is good!

Another reason that I wanted to meet with you is that I have had the pleasure of meeting on a number of occasions during the past several months and working with your wonderful State Committee. I wanted to see

these gentlemen again. Al Heald and I could tell you some real interesting experiences he and I have had on numerous occasions the past several years. Again, ladies and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate your inviting me to be with you and I would like to spend a few minutes with you, in discussion of what I conceive to be and what I believe to be the heart and nerve center of ASCS and I have reference, of course, to the Agricultural Conservation Program. As Morris told you, in my present position, I have the responsibility, under the leadership of Secretary Freeman and Administrator Godfrey, of directing the administration of the Agricultural Conservation Program, Cropland Conversion Program, Emergency ACP and other conservation responsibilities of ASCS on a National level. I have been in this position, and I've got to tell you this, only a little more than 9 months - about 10 months to be exact - and I would be the first to confess, ladies and gentlemen, that there is still an awful lot about this job that I don't know. I will never be the authority on the conservation needs of Vermont that you are and I never expect to be. I hope, however, that even though I think I recognize the fact that there is still quite a bit I need to know about this program, I hope I'm not in the position of a young fellow I heard about not too long ago.

This fellow was just a youngster, just out of school. He had never worked anywhere in his life but decided he wanted to get a job. So he walked down the street one morning, just a youngster, just out of school, and he passed a drugstore. There was a sign in the window, "Help wanted." So he goes in and applies for the job and he got it. The next morning he reports for work so he goes in and the manager tells him a little bit about what he wants him to do and said, "Now I want you to answer the telephone." So, in about 5 minutes the telephone rings. This youngster goes over and picks up the receiver and says, "Hello," and the voice at the other end of the line was a lady, a feminine voice. She said, "Is this the drug store?" He said, "Yes Ma'am." She said, "I want some information. Can you tell me if Pepto Bismol is good for a stomach-ache?" This youngster thought a few minutes, then scratched his head and stuttered and stammered around. She said, "I asked you a question. It was a very simple question. Is Pepto Bismol good for a stomach-ache?" He finally spoke up. He said, "Lady, I want to tell you one thing. I just came to work here and when I said hello to you, I told you everything I knew." I hope I'm not in that position, ladies and gentlemen.

During the past 9 or 10 months I have had the occasion to meet and talk with many groups about the conservation work that we are doing in ASCS and in agriculture. I have had the occasion to meet with civic organizations, Kiwanis Clubs, JC's, Chambers of Commerce, Rotaries, farm organization meetings as well as our own people. And there is one thing that I have found, ladies and gentlemen, that I am concerned about and I think you are concerned about. I am concerned with the apparent lack of understanding I have found on the part of many good, intelligent, straight-thinking, forward-looking people especially in cities and small towns as to the justification of the United States Government spending 250 million a year to help farmers conserve their soil and water. I have found that too many people do not understand this program and why it is in their interests and why it is in the National interest that we have such a program. And I found this is not confined to any one part of the country. I found this lack of understanding to be equally true in California as it is in Chicago or as it is in a small 2000 population town in my native State of Tennessee or in a great metropolitan area like New York City.

But the fact remains that many people in this country, Morris, do not understand why we have this program, why it is needed, and why it is in the National interest that we have the Agricultural Conservation Program. Too many people view it as some sort of a gigantic giveaway program or a subsidy program. And I think that this presents a tremendous challenge to those of us who have the responsibility of carrying this program on, seeing that it is served to the best of our ability and seeing that it serves the farm people of this Nation. It presents a tremendous challenge to us to try to get this point understood and accepted because it is important not only to the farmers that we do this but for the future of this country and the man in the city as well as the man on the farm, because we all have a responsibility in the maintenance of our natural resources. And it is in this line that I would like to talk with you the next few minutes, and I am sure that nothing that I am going to say will be anything that you don't already know but in view, I think, of the importance of the Agricultural Conservation Program and especially in view of the rumors that we have heard going around for the past several months about a possibility of this program being reduced or curtailed.

I think it is time that we take a few minutes out of our busy day-to-day schedule and think a little bit in terms of what the program has done, what it is intended to do, and what it can mean and will mean to the future of this Nation, as well as to the future of the American farmer. I said a few minutes ago that ACP is the heart and nerve center of ASCS. There is a reason why I made this statement. And I will tell you what it is. To begin with, and you know this, the legislative authority for the Agricultural Conservation Program is the Act of 1938, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938 which also created the committee system. There are no two operations of this agency that are more closely related than this highly successful experiment in administration, namely, the committee system, and the ACP. My point is that the legal legislative authority for ACP is also the legislative authority for the committee system or for the system of letting farmers run their own program. And to me this is necessary, I think, in the administration of any program directly affecting farm people. I believe in the committee system.

I have made this statement also because of this fact. We have many programs in this agency to administer. In some States we have a big Feed Grain Program. Here is a county that has a gigantic Feed Grain Program but it has a good ACP Program; here is a county over here whose primary activity is the administration of a Peanut and Tobacco Program, but it also has an ACP Program; here is a county out in the West which is primarily concerned with wheat. They have a big program for wheat but they have an ACP Program. Here is a county that has no Tobacco Program, has no Wheat Program, it has very little Feed Grain but it has an ACP Program. My point is this -- this is the only nationwide universal program that you administer which is applicable and in force in every single, solitary county, every single, solitary town, and every rural community of this Nation. It has been estimated that in the absence of ACP we would possibly need about 1/3 less county offices in the Nation and we would probably need about 38% fewer people to run the program. I point this out not because we justify a program in terms of the number of offices you need to administer it or in terms of the number of people needed to run it but I think this is something we need to recognize. The only justification for any Federal

program, in my opinion, is not in terms of people that you employ to run it. This is incidental. Not in terms of the number of offices you have to have, but you justify a Federal program in terms of what this program does for the country, what it does for the people it's intended to serve and whether or not it is in the National interest.

And it is in those terms, my friends, that I think we can certainly justify the Agricultural Conservation Program. Now, let's think together. Stick with me for a few minutes. Let's see if we can re-define in our own words why we need the ACP. Indeed, why have an ACP? I think we need this program because ACP produces conservation in this country without exceeding its cost. The relatively modest appropriation for ACP leads to at least double that amount of conservation activity. And you and I know that it helps farmers in conservation work or to start conservation work, that many of them will continue as long as they farm, at their own expense. In the Nation as a whole during the past 4 years, about $2\frac{1}{4}$ million farmers, or farms rather, have participated in this ACP -- about $2\frac{1}{4}$ million. The cost-sharing of conservation practices on a farm has a multiplied effect on local business. This is a side effect. The cost-sharing of conservation practices on farms helps the local businessman because it has a multiplied effect on local business and this is a point we should drive home. Both the Government's share and the farmer's share are spent in the local community for the most part. We know this. This money might go for land; it might go for fertilizer; it might go for seed; it might go for seedlings; it might go for equipment work; but the fact remains that the ACP cost-sharing money that you gentlemen on the county committees approve and that you people in the county offices disburse, this money is spent in the local community and it makes many, many cash registers ring up and down Main Street that otherwise might not be ringing in the absence of this program.

Most of us basically being human, I think we need to remind some of our good friends in the cities and the towns and up and down Main Street, who might be a little bit passive in this program that they too have a stake in ACP, and their profit and loss statement might not be quite as good at the end of the year without it as with it. ACP is a catalyst. It is an incentive that gets work done that otherwise would not get done and it succeeds, there is no question about it.

All right, let's go a little bit further. Let's continue to think together. Why do we need this program? We need it because the average farmer cannot carry alone the total burden of conservation that needs to be done. He can't do it. I can't do it. I have owned a farm practically all of my adult life and I know that on my own farm, ladies and gentlemen, there are certain conservation measures that should be done but I cannot depend upon the income from that farm and I think that I'm an average farmer, not the best but I'm not the worst. But I can't depend upon the net income above operating expenses on that farm to the extent that I could do the conservation work that I know should be done. The conservation work that should be carried out must be carried out through the farm family because he controls the land. But, generally speaking, the farm family hasn't had the financial means necessary to carry out conservation practices on the scale that needs to be done. I think we know this.

I have heard Administrator Godfrey sometimes express it this way. I have heard Horace say that with most farmers conservation can never come first. I think he is right. I know he is right. Why? Because, ladies and gentlemen, no matter how desirable conservation may be either socially, economically or otherwise, the man on this land has a prior responsibility before he can think in terms of carrying out conservation. He has a prior responsibility for giving his family a decent standard of living, of buying food and clothing. He has a prior responsibility for giving his children the best education that he can. He has the prior responsibility of paying his taxes and as a businessman he must reserve from this year to the next, if he can, working capital to plant and put his crops in next year. And it is only after he does these things, he is in a position to invest his limited resources in conservation, which, generally speaking, are long-range investments. This is why that I say with most of us, with most farms, conservation never comes first. If we are to get conservation applied to the land at a more rapid rate, and we need to do this, then there must be a growing economic ability of the farm family to do the job. Of course, one answer is direct financial assistance for conservation and that is the role of ACP.

Let's continue a little bit further with our soul searching. Why do we need this program? Let's think a little bit further. Why do we have it? Because, ladies and gentlemen, cost-sharing with farmers is economically and morally right. To my knowledge there is nothing in the pricing mechanism of the farm economy to provide for the replacement or maintenance of the farm's productivity plant. What I have said is that I know of nothing in our economic mechanism to provide assistance to a farmer for replacement of his productivity plant. Each time that we plant a crop on the soil we take something out of the soil. But there is nothing that I know of in the economy of the pricing mechanism that helps the farmer replace what he takes from the soil. The farmer has no depreciation allowance for his land and each time you plow this land and plant it you depreciate it but you have no depreciation allowance, my friends, and I have no depreciation allowance. Yet, in the last 30 years the mineral depletion subsidies have totaled more than 40 billion dollars. The farmer has nothing like that to help him maintain his soil and water resources. Yet, I think that this Nation has an even greater stake in its land than it does in its mineral resources? Do you agree? Because land is still a necessity for the production of food and notwithstanding the rapid advancements that we have made in many, many fields, we have yet to come up with a good substitute for food, at least we haven't been able to do it yet without land. So I maintain that the Nation has a greater stake in its land than it does in its mineral resources. Rather than try to build into the farm pricing structure some kind of an allowance for resource maintenance it seems more realistic to provide assistance directly for conservation work. In this way we are sure that we get a dollar received for each dollar spent and that is the role of ACP.

Let's think a little bit further together. Why have this program? Why not get rid of it? I think we have it because I believe we can say, ladies and gentlemen, that every citizen in this country -- you, I, all of us -- that we have an obligation to the future. We have an obligation to posterity and I think the modest contribution that each of us makes to our

payment of taxes and the translation of this income to the Government into \$250 million for conservation work, I think this is a slight payment on our obligation to posterity. I'm not getting philosophical on this thing. I am simply thinking out loud. I think we all need ammunition to justify this program and to explain why we need it. Actually, we are far behind in the conservation job in this country. Some time back the Department caused to be made what we called a conservation needs inventory, and according to this inventory, to do the conservation job that needs to be done we should be investing as a Nation in conservation about $2\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars annually and we actually as a Nation are investing at the rate of about $\frac{1}{3}$ of this amount -- both public and private funds -- about 800 million. I think the results of this insufficiency are plain. About 2 out of every 3 acres of cropland in this country need conservation treatment -- about 2 out of every 3 acres. About $\frac{3}{4}$ of our privately-owned pastureland still needs conservation treatment and more than half of our forest land is still in need of conservation treatment. But my point is that we still have a long, long way to go in doing the conservation job that should be done.

We have the technical know-how to do the conservation job. This knowledge now is in the hands of conservationists, very capable, competent conservationists in every farm county in this Nation -- the knowledge -- but generally speaking the farmer no longer neglects the land because he doesn't or cannot get technical help. Today with most of us, it is a question of pure, simple economics and that is where ACP fills the gap.

Now, just one step further. You've heard it said that we are running some programs in the Department of Agriculture that are working at cross-purposes, haven't you? You've heard some critics of the program say, "How do you justify a program such as the Feed Grain Program or the Wheat Stabilization Program in which we are using hundreds of millions of dollars of money to take land out of production? How do you reconcile this with programs such as ACP, on the other hand, under which you are spending \$250 million a year to make land more productive? Isn't one working at cross-purposes with the other?" You've heard this and there is an answer to it and a very valid and legitimate answer. ACP complements the other programs and instead of working at cross-purposes with the other production adjustment programs it acts as a supplement to those programs because it is encouraging the shift of acreage out of production of surplus crops and into grasses and trees. We know this. It is reliably and conservatively estimated, ladies and gentlemen, that ACP over the past, I believe, 10 years has helped in diverting something over 20 million acres of land out of the production of crops that we do not need and into the production of grasses and trees -- over 20 million acres which otherwise would be in production in the absence of this program which has encouraged this shift in land use. Now had this program not been in existence and had this 20 million acres plus which we have taken out of production through ACP -- had this 20 million acres been in crop use, it would have resulted in about 7% more production nationwide -- feed grains and wheat and those crops that we do not need -- to the extent that these programs which had been relatively successful would have been seriously and severely handicapped and would have cost many, many millions of dollars more than they have. This is the answer.

Or we could go on and on and I would dearly love to do so, but time is slipping by. I would feel a little bit remiss, a little bit neglectful if I didn't go a little bit further. I will be very frank with you. You and I in this room -- I don't think we need any convincing as to the value of the ACP. I don't think we need any convincing here. We need to refresh our minds once in a while. We need to reason together. We need to think together, but we don't need much convincing, otherwise we wouldn't be here if we didn't believe in these programs. I wouldn't and I don't think you would, but the fact remains that if we are to maintain our strength in the program, and I speak specifically of ACP, we must do a better job in the future than we have done in the past of getting people to really understand the justification in having such a program. In my opinion this program will not be maintained at all unless we stop just selling ACP to ourselves -- those of us who are directly engaged in agriculture, and start constantly reminding urban people of the importance of ACP to them and to the Nation. The fact, ladies and gentlemen, that this program has been in existence for 30 years is no reason for us to assume or to believe that it will be everlasting, because unfortunately that is not the case.

I started working on farm programs about 30 years ago. At that time a large percentage of the total population of this country were people living on the land or farm - a short 30 years ago. But as Charlie Cox told you last night, today our numbers, and when I say ours, I mean myself and those of us here in this room who farm, our numbers have diminished to the extent that we now represent only about 7% of the people. And there are becoming fewer and fewer farmers each year. The experts tell us that this percentage will probably go down to about 4%. So whether we like it or not, we have got to be realistic. We have got to be complete realists. No longer can we depend on our numerical strength or on a farm bloc in Congress to get and hold farm programs. We've got to be smart. We've got to work to create an understanding and an acceptance of farm programs among the vast majority of the population who live off the farm and in the absence of our ability to do this, farm programs are declining proportionately. So, we are in a minority group. But the products of this land, this big, amalgamated business called agri-business, is not in the minority, and this we should not forget. It isn't a minority business because about 44% of the economy of this country is based on the products that come from this land -- 44% of our total business is based on the products that you and I and other farmers produce. And the business that this creates - processors, storage, traffic, transportation, handling -- this is not a minority, my friends. So this is a real important problem at hand. I think we have now reached the time when we of a necessity must face the political facts of life as I have just pointed out. I have said that 7% or less than 7% of the inhabitants of this land live on farms and nationwide only about 1/5 of the people that still live on farms unfortunately participate in ACP, notwithstanding the wonderful record that you people have accomplished here.

I was sincere when I told you that I wanted to know how you did it and I still want to talk with Al and I want to talk to some of your fieldmen, county committeemen and your State Committee, but my point is that we've got to be political realists. Suppose you were a Congressman, my friends, and

suppose you came back home to attend a little meeting and suppose in this meeting there were 100 of your colleagues, or rather of your constituents, at this meeting. And of this 100, only 7 were farmers and of that 7 only 2 were participating in the ACP. Now, suppose that the program was a red hot issue in the Congress and suppose you were being pressured this way and you were being pulled that way -- which way would you go? This is why we have no choice but to do an educational job, a selling job. It's something you can take pride in selling -- you are helping not only the farmers, your neighbors, but you are helping to insure the future of this country if we can get people to understand it.

In closing, I would just like to say this. The facts are that we don't need to do less conservation. We need to do more. We don't need to be less concerned about erosion, silting and pollution -- we need to be more concerned. We do not have less of an obligation to posterity than we did 30 years ago -- we have a greater responsibility to posterity. Our water problems are not smaller -- they are larger and will continue to be larger as our population grows. I think, ladies and gentlemen, this calls for forward steps not only by ASCS but by every other organization in this country interested in the conservation of our soil, water, wildlife and recreational opportunities and some of the primeval beauty of our still young Nation. I think the cause of conservation calls for progress and not retreat. Surely, the future of our irreplaceable resources is in our hands, because we have control of the land. Wise use of land is basic to the future of this country and what our great leader President Johnson has envisioned as the "Great Society." The way that we will respond to that will undoubtedly be marked in the history of our Nation and of civilization. So each of you believe with me that ACP is a program for all of our people, that it is in the interests not only of farmers but of all the people in this country to maintain it and build and strengthen this program. I solicit your help. I want your help. I want your advice. I want your counsel in strengthening and building this vital program. I ask for your cooperation and assure you of mine.

Thank you very much.

CURRENT DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF USDA

Address by A. F. Heald, State Executive Director
Vermont ASCS State Office
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 22, 1965

I want to stress to you the importance of defense activities. The Secretary has stated that defense is part of our over-all job. We must take this assignment along with the others.

To point up the need for this work, I have arranged to have a film shown here this morning. The film is entitled, "One Week in October." It will speak for itself. (A 30-minute film was shown at this point).

In preparing for today's meeting I had thought that I would make some brief statements on county chairmen and county office managers' responsibilities. These I had planned would be in pass-out material that you could take home, study and follow. In preparing to do this, I found that the County Defense Operations Handbook has already done this for you. What the county chairmen and county office managers really need to do is to study this handbook and carry out the functions outlined in it. It is written in clear terms with specific assignments. I have read too many times in your minutes that you don't know what you are supposed to do. This is lazy thinking. There is plenty to do.

To be more specific, one of the things you can do is to study the emergency reporting system. This is outlined in the handbook in great detail. It is suggested that you plan at your next meeting to have each member come prepared to fill out the report that they are responsible for.

We expect county boards to have at least 4 meetings a year. The fieldmen will help you. Let's resolve to do a better defense job.

Meetings to Date

I have prepared a list which I will now distribute which shows the number of county defense board meetings held to date. You can see from this list that there were a total of 38 meetings held by counties in 1963 and 25 in 1964. Some counties have only held one a year. Once again, I want to point out to you that to do your job and do it well it would appear that you should have meetings at least quarterly.

I have asked one of our co-workers, Dick Holmes, Deputy Director of Civil Defense, to be with us today and bring us up to date on "Emergency Broadcast Facilities." We appreciate very much the cooperation Mr. Holmes has given us and congratulate him on the good job that he has done. -- Mr. Holmes

EMERGENCY BROADCAST FACILITIES

Address by Richard Holmes, Deputy Director,
Civil Defense, Vermont
at the ASCS State Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 22, 1965

The new emergency broadcast facilities are a great step ahead. We believe that this system is far superior to anything we have had. We want you folks to understand how it works.

I have here (referring to map) a map of the State of Vermont which shows the way this system is set up to operate. You will note from this map that we have full coverage in the State.

NAWAS (National Warning System) consists of full-period, private-line voice circuits leased telephone lines interconnecting the National Warning Center Headquarters with various Federal agencies and the eight Regional Offices.

Vermont has seven warning points. They are:

Montpelier	State Civil Defense Headquarters
Burlington	Fire Station
St. Johnsbury	State Police Office
Rutland	State Police Office
Bellows Falls	State Police Office
Bennington	Police Station
Hartford	Fire Station

Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) is a system set up by the Federal Communications Commission whereby any information pertaining to a national emergency may be broadcast over the radio system to all areas of the country. FCC has picked various radio stations for this job and the people are advised to tune to their area station in times of a national emergency for instructions.

Vermont has six of these stations. They are:

WTSA	Brattleboro
WIKE	Newport
WSYB	Rutland
WTWN	St. Johnsbury
WDEV	Waterbury
WVMT	Burlington

Copies of the National Warning System and the Emergency Broadcast System are being supplied to Mr. Heald who will distribute them to the counties.

Thanks much for your invitation to attend your conference. We appreciate very much the cooperation we have received from State and County USDA Defense Boards.

WHEAT STABILIZATION PROGRAM

1965 Voluntary Wheat Program

The 1965 wheat program is designed to appeal to the largest possible number of producers and to encourage maximum participation. It is not only voluntary but very flexible, offering farmers a number of attractive choices, diversion payments, price support loans, and marketing certificates. Good participation in the program will maintain wheat income, reduce the surplus, and keep government costs down.

The national wheat acreage allotment for 1965 has been set at 49.5 million acres. Since the law provides for increases in allotments for certain farms with small wheat allotments (15 acres or less), the total of all farm wheat allotments for 1965 will be about 53 million acres.

Provisions

1. There are no marketing quotas for 1965 and consequently no marketing penalties.
2. Wheat may be sold by producers whenever and wherever they desire, whether they are program participants or not, except wheat which has been bonded under the **excess wheat provision**.
3. The approved conserving uses for acreage diverted from wheat are:
 - a. Permanent-type or rotation cover of grasses and legumes.
 - b. Temporary cover of grasses and legumes.
 - c. Wildlife food and habitat plantings.
 - d. Trees and shrubs.
 - e. Other conservation uses.
4. Conserving bases determined for wheat farms for 1964 program remain in effect.
5. The domestic marketing allocation is 45% of the normal production of the farm.
6. Farmers who have wheat allotments and feed grain bases may sign up to participate in both the feed grain and the wheat programs and elect to produce wheat on their feed grain acres or to produce feed grain on their wheat acreage.
7. Wheat producers may choose to overplant their farm wheat acreage allotments by as much as 50% and store the excess production under bond. These producers will be eligible for marketing certificates and price support loans. However, if any of the bonded excess is not properly stored until released by underplanting or overproduction on the farm in a future year, the producer may be required to refund an amount equal to 1 1/2 times the value of the certificates received on the bonded excess.

8. The national average price support loan rate is \$1.40 a bushel.
9. Domestic marketing certificates worth 75 cents a bushel on a maximum 45% of the normal production of the farm allotment.
10. Export marketing certificates worth 30 cents a bushel on a maximum 35% of the normal production of the farm allotment.
11. Wheat producers taking part in the program who plant as much as 80% of their allotments for harvest will be eligible for the full amount of certificates. When fewer acres are planted for harvest, the amount of the certificates will be reduced. Any reduction in the amount of certificates will first be made in the lower valued export certificates.
12. To qualify for price support loans and certificates only, a producer needs to meet the following minimum conditions:
 - a. Sign up for the program on or before March 26, 1965.
 - b. Devote an acreage equal to 11.11% of the farm wheat allotment to conserving uses in addition to the farm conserving base.
 - c. On all farms in which he has an interest in the wheat, produce within the wheat allotment, participate under the substitution provisions, or store authorized excess under bond.
 - d. Stay within the effective allotments for any other crops on the participating farm.

Participation

As of March 25, 877,257 wheat producers signed up to participate with an effective allotment of 43,736,138 acres on enrolled farms or 82% of the national total. The cumulative wheat acreage diversion of 7,320,125 acres is composed of 4,859,087 acres reduction needed to participate in the 1965 program and 2,451,308 acres intended additional voluntary diversion below the allotments.

NORTHEAST AREA

TABLE I

State	Total No. Wheat Farms	No. Farms Signed Up	Effective Allotment		Total In- tended Diversion Acres
			Total Acres	On Signed Farms Acres	
Conn.	77	4	19	19	12
Del.	1,515	505	26,978	14,162	1,983
Maine	27	11	205	114	38
Md.	13,092	2,901	163,359	64,352	13,280
Mass.	25	6	196	62	22
Mich.	113,136	47,398	1,124,881	622,939	201,242
N. H.	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
N. J.	4,322	1,510	49,631	29,281	8,297
N. Y.	33,654	17,854	313,897	220,322	96,503
Pa.	72,630	18,542	560,116	187,933	75,233
R. I.	12	0	116	0	0
*Vt.	77	0	479	0	0
Va.	43,161	16,350	280,214	151,691	67,281
United States	1,716,370	877,257	53,243,451	43,736,138	7,320,125

*Vermont's 77 wheat farms and effective allotment acres are as follows:
 Addison County - 53 wheat farms, 308 acres; Chittenden County - 11 wheat
 farms, 97 acres; Grand Isle County - 11 wheat farms, 47 acres; Orleans
 County - 1 wheat farm, 19 acres.

Proposed 1966 Wheat Program

The USDA has issued by proclamation a national wheat marketing quota of 1,292,000,000 bushels and a national allotment of 51.8 million acres including small farm acreage increases. The proclamation must be issued before April 15, 1965 in the absence of new legislation for the 1966 crop year. A referendum must be held before August 1, 1965 to determine whether wheat farmers favor or oppose marketing quotas for 1966 if legislation is not enacted.

Washington, D. C.

Testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture on Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 before the House Committee on Agriculture.

Excerpts:

1. During the past four years record high levels of grain stocks have been reduced to manageable levels.
2. Wheat stocks have dropped from 1.4 billion bushels to below 900 million bushels.
3. Feed grain carryover will have decreased from 85 million tons to about 56 million tons.
4. A total reduction in wheat and feed grain stocks of over 1.5 billion bushels during past 4 years.
5. If Commodity Credit Corporation held this quantity in their inventories for a full year, carrying charges (storage, handling, transportation, and interest) would be about \$650 million.
6. Reduction in costs and inventories, as well as the increase in realized net farm income, are in large part the result of the voluntary feed grain and wheat programs enacted by Congress since 1961.
7. Without these actions, it is estimated that the nation's farmers would have added 3.4 billion bushels of wheat and feed grain to carryover stocks which would have ultimately resulted in substantial additional costs for carrying charges (storage, handling, transportation, interest), substantially greater than the diversion and other payments made to producers in return for voluntarily curtailing production these past four years.
8. With the certificate program for wheat and rice we seek to eliminate the export subsidy, and at the same time significantly cut government costs.
9. Title I of the Act would continue and improve the voluntary wheat program enacted last year. The principal change would be to raise the maximum level of price support on wheat used for human food in the United States to 100% of parity, or approximately \$2.50 per bushel. The price supports for domestic food wheat from the 1964 and 1965 crops is \$2.00 per bushel. The 1966 provision would increase producer returns by at least \$150 million and reduction in export subsidy costs.

Wool Program*

A. Background

1. Authorized under the National Wool Act of 1954.
2. Act extended in 1961 through the 1965 marketing year.
3. Congress is presently considering a proposal to extend the Act through 1967.

B. Purpose

1. To increase the domestic production of wool to 300,000,000 pounds per year.
2. Provide incentive payments to producers to be applied to the net proceeds received by producers for shorn wool and unshorn lambs.

C. Provisions

1. Secretary of Agriculture will establish the incentive price each year. This has been 62¢ a pound since the beginning of the program.
2. Marketing year is now January 1, 1965 to December 31, 1965.
3. The Act limits the cumulative payments under the program to amount equal to 70% of the duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures.
4. A self help promotion program to increase the market for wool and lambs. This provides for 1¢ per pound deduction from shorn wool and 5¢ per hundredweight for unshorn lambs incentive payment.

D. 1964 Rates of Payments

1. Shorn wool payments for 1964 marketing year will amount to 16 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of the dollar returns each grower receives from the sale of unshorn wool during the period from January through December 1964.
2. The announced payment rate of 35¢ per hundredweight on unshorn lambs to compensate for the wool on hand.

E. Cost

1. On February 1, 1965 payments under the program for the 1963 marketing year totaled \$27,100,000. \$22,000,000 on shorn wool and \$5,100,000 on unshorn lambs.
2. About \$3,000,000 a year goes to the American Sheep Producers Council for promotion of wool and lamb.

*Presented at State ASCS Conference by G. T. Hart

F. Program Details

1. A recent survey of sheep growers in the State indicates that there are about 330 growers. 165 applied for payment in the 1964 marketing year.
 - a. We suggest that wool information including leaflet PA-621 be sent to each known producer in your county.
2. There are still some wool producers who received 40 to 45 cents per pound for their wool this last marketing year. The average received by the State growers was 58¢. The National average received by all US wool growers is 53.2¢ per pound. We should let those growers who are receiving low prices for their clip know about the possibilities of marketing through Vermont wool pools.
3. We should make our wool payments as soon as possible. Payments were authorized on and after April 1.
4. Look over each wool application to make sure that the amount of wool sold is in line with the number of sheep kept. Eight pounds of wool per animal is the National average.
5. In cases where wool buyers file an application for payment, make sure they actually own sheep and that the amount of wool is in line with the number of sheep kept.
6. Be sure to secure complete sales documents to support applications for payments.

Feed Grain Program *

A. Background

The 1965 Feed Grain Program is the 5th year of this voluntary feed grain reduction program. This program on a National scale is designed to:

1. Raise farm income by assuring fair prices for feed grain producers and to provide stability of livestock prices.
2. Continue substantial progress toward the National goal of a 45 to 50 million ton feed grain carryover.

Previous programs are already credited with reducing carryover from 85 million tons to 58 million tons.

3. Reduce program costs to taxpayers by reducing the storage cost of grain held in Government inventory.

B. We are all familiar with the operation of the Feed Grain Program. Let's look at the status of this program, nationally and in Vermont. See attached sheet "Accomplishments of the Feed Grain Programs."

C. Job Ahead for 1965

1. Signup completed on March 26. There may be a few late signers.
2. Advance payments are now being made.
3. Measuring needs to be completed by June 20.
 - a. Urged to measure earlier this year.
 - b. Reporter must be trained to understand the program and to make sure the farmers understand the terms of compliance.
 - c. Flags have been provided for marking field boundaries.
4. Compliance instructions have been sent to counties and a flow chart covering the compliance job will be sent soon.

* Presented at 1965 State ASCS Conference by G. T. Hart.

April 14, 1965

1965 Feed Grain Program

<u>County</u>	<u>No. Farms Signed Up</u>	<u>Base Acreage on Signed Farms</u>	<u>Acres to be Diverted</u>
Addison	22	421	375
Bennington	22	305	254
Caledonia	17	144	127
Chittenden	42	* 738	621
Essex	1	4	4
Franklin	13	188	177
Grand Isle	17	321	267
Lamoille	9	110	101
Orange	28	341	307
Orleans	12	151	146
Rutland	35	555	478
Washington	33	355	324
Windham	11	226	141
Windsor	<u>5</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>52</u>
Total	267	3921	3374

* Inc. Barley - Base Ac. - 52 - Div. Ac. - 42

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

The dramatic increase in feed grain productive capacity in the last decade has created great problems -- problems of overproduction, of market prices and of government costs.

By 1961, the feed grain situation was nearing a production crisis. Most of it concerned corn, of which we had 2 billion bushels in stock. Sorghum grain supplies amounted to 1-1/2 years' supply. Total feed grain stocks were 85 million tons. We were nearing the danger point where these massive supplies would break out and flood the market. Storage costs for feed grains had reached 464 million dollars a year.

So the emergency feed grain bill was passed by the Congress early in 1961, the first piece of legislation signed by the new administration.

It reduced feed grain stocks by about 13 million tons or approximately 475 million bushels. The downward trend in grain prices was stopped and the threat posed to livestock growers by vast quantities of cheap feed was eased.

So successful was this legislation, it has been modified only slightly, and it has been continued through 1965.

Each of the four years 1961-1964, around 1.2 million feed grain producers signed up to participate. In 1961, they diverted 25.2 million acres; in 1962, 28.2 million acres, and 1965, they have signed to divert 36.6 million acres.

Although there was a bumper crop of corn in 1963, feed grain stocks declined further because of increased utilization. The programs for 1961, 1962, 1963 and 1964 have reduced the feed grain carryover from 85 million tons to less than 60 million tons.

The program provisions for 1965 are improved, and should result in participation by cooperating farmers that will bring the Nation's feed grain carryover nearer the goal of 45 to 50 million tons.

Had there been no feed grain program, it is easy to figure out what would have happened in 1964. Production of corn, grain sorghums, and barley would have been around 800 million bushels larger if the harvested acreage of the three grains had been the same as in 1959-60 -- before the first feed grain program.

(over)

Total Diversion and
Price Support Payments Earned
1961-62-63-64 Feed Grain Programs

	<u>1961</u> \$1000	<u>1962</u> \$1000	<u>1963</u> \$1000	<u>1964</u> \$1000	<u>Total</u> \$1000	<u>Total Diversion Payment and Price Support 1961-64</u> \$1000
U.S.	781,863	843,842	462,853	389,256	2,977,814	3,642,735
NE	108	168	290	380	946	985
VT.	38	49	87	109	283	289

1961-65 FGP Signup

	<u>1961</u> Acres	<u>1962</u> Acres	<u>1963</u> Acres	<u>1964</u> Acres	<u>1965</u> Acres
U.S.	26.7 mil.	32.6 mil.	25.7 mil.	34.3 mil.	36.6 mil.
VT.	942	1191	2216	2859	3400

Carryover Stocks of Feed Grains
(Million Tons)

<u>1961</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>Goal</u>
84.7	63.1	58	45 - 50

1965

Final 1.5 million farms to divert 36.6 million acres - represents an increase of 104,445 farms signed up intending to divert 2.5 million more acres.

County Informational Activities*

A. Introduction

If we are to have effective local administration of farm programs, an adequate understanding of the objectives in operations is essential.

1. To bring about adequate understanding by those who need to know, it is necessary **first** that we ourselves understand what programs are available. By we, ourselves, I mean county office personnel, county committees and the community committeemen. We must have a thorough understanding of the general operating procedures, the purposes and the requirements of each program which we have in operation in our county.
2. Secondly, farmers need to know what programs are available. How and when they must take action to participate and the requirements and obligations involved. This is the primary information responsibility of county offices.
3. At the same time, full exchange of information with other county agricultural agencies and organizations is essential to make sure that we have a coordinated and effective service to the farmer.
4. In addition, John Q. Public has a right to know what is going on in ASCS because he is a taxpayer and has a direct interest in the program operations and results of these program operations. The general public includes Mr. Average Citizen as well as bankers, agricultural supply agencies, merchants, warehousemen, professional and civic groups. They are entitled to reports on the public business and activities carried out in their communities.

B. Who is to do the information job?

Of course, the Extension Service is the official educational arm of the U. S. Department of Agriculture in the field. In Vermont, we enjoy excellent working relationship with the Extension Service through local county agents and it is expected that news releases, radio tapes, State television programs, etc. be coordinated through the County Extension people and we hope that you will ask them for their assistance in developing this type of informational activity.

However, such assistance should be supplemented by the ASCS people to the extent necessary to discharge their obligation for effective program administration which requires adequate information to be disseminated in the area.

C. How can we do the information job?

There are many ways in which information on ASCS programs is disseminated and we are familiar with most of these media, such as newspaper articles, radio, television, meetings, circular letters, field days and tours, informative talks, letters, and exhibits.

I'd like to call your attention to ASCS Guide No. 2, "Farm Program Information Guides for ASCS County Offices." This was sent to you people with ASC letter 1217 back in 1961 or 1962. As to the how of many of these things, there are many important items emphasizing how to improve talks, how to work with newspapers, how to inform farmers through the county offices, etc., contained in this ASCS information guide. I suggest when you get back you look through this guide, do a little studying, and see if there aren't some helpful hints in there that can lead you to do a better information job. Now I'd like to discuss with you the methods already being used in Vermont.

D. What we are currently doing in Vermont

1. Monthly State Office News Notes - Are there any suggestions from the group as to how we can improve these news notes? Do you think that they are currently worthwhile, etc.?
2. County tours: Quite a number of counties had tours last year; what benefit do you feel has accrued as a result of these tours?
3. Farmer-Businessman Suppers: Probably, the folks in Franklin County have had the longest string of annual farmer-businessman suppers of any county in the State. I'd like to hear a few comments from the Franklin County Committee as to what they think they have gained by having these annual farmer-businessman suppers.
4. A Speakers Bureau: I heard the other day that Caledonia County has appointed a committeeman who will act as the official spokesman for the county ASCS work and is available for speaking to civic groups, etc., about ASCS. I'd like your comments on that idea from Caledonia County.

E. Summary of the Discussion and Conclusions

1. County ASCS people have an obligation to keep others informed of ASCS activities. Others include cooperating agricultural agencies, farmers, businessmen, bankers, professional and civic groups and John Q. Public.
2. We should make a special effort to improve our public information program this coming year.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS 1/
All Counties

1966 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM *

A. PROGRAM POLICIES

1. The general program principles are outlined in the current State or County Practice Handbook. What are your comments on these principles?

All counties voted for the same program principles as in 1965.

2. What changes are needed to make the program work better in your county?

Ten counties had no suggestions to offer; the remaining four counties commented as follows:

- a. Give more weight to woodland in making county allocations.
- b. Establish a uniform State farm limit.
- c. Have the county committee and other agency representatives determine how woodland acreage would affect the county allocation and, if advisable, notify the State Committee.

B. PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

In keeping with the above program policies, what practices and cost-share rates are recommended for 1966? (Use last year's practices as a basis for discussion.)

Practice 1 - Lime

All counties voted for the same practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: See table on page 2.

Practice 2 - New Seeding

12 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1965, one county voted to change the wording of condition (1), and one county voted to reduce the cost-sharing on cash practice to the same as CMS. Several counties have agreed to certain stipulations as noted below:

- a. A farmer must use lime or prove by test that it is not needed.
(Caledonia County)
- b. Require 2 tons of lime per acre unless soil test shows otherwise.
(Essex and Orange Counties)

*The questions listed are those which were discussed at the ASCS Program Planning Meetings in the Spring of 1965.

1/ For Review at 1965 State ASCS Conference.

- c. Require a minimum of 1 ton of lime per acre treated with cost-shared mixed fertilizer or prove by test it is not needed. (Outland and Windsor Counties)
- d. Not approved unless lime was used in the previous year or ordered for the current year, or a soil test shows lime is not needed. Minimum pH is 6.5 (Windham County)
- e. Encourage soil tests but do not require them. (Grand Isle County)
- f. Require a soil test by a recognized laboratory. (Orleans County)

Cost-share: See table on page 2.

Practice 3 - Improvement of Hay or Pasture

11 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1965; one county voted to reduce the cost-sharing on cash practice to the same as CMS; one voted to add boron; and one voted to add under condition (4) "or lesser amounts if determined by soil tests" to the third sentence. The same stipulations as shown under Practice 2 were made for this practice.

Cost-share: See table on page 2.

Table on 1965 Rates with Recommendations for 1966
for Practices 1, 2, 3 and 19(a)

County	Lime		Mixed Fert.		Super	
	Gov. % of	of BS Cost	Gov. % of Cost*		Gov. % of Cost**	
	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed
	1965	1966	1965	1966	1965	1966
Addison	50	50	33	33	36	36
Benn.	50	50	32	32	29	29
Cal.	50	50	36	36	36	36
Chitt.	50	50	36	36	36	36
Essex	47	47	31	31	36	36
Frank.	44	44	36	36	36	36
Gr. Is.	50	50	36	36	36	36
Iam.	46	46	34	34	36	36
Orange	50	50	38	38	36	36
Orleans	47	47	35	35	36	36
Outland	46	50	38	38	36	36
Wash.	50	50	34	34	36	36
Windham	PO	PO	PO	PO	36	36
Windsor	46	46	38	38	36	36

*Based on % of cost of contract 0-15-30 or 0-25-25

**Based on % of cost of contract 20% super delivered to RR sidings

Practice 4 - Planting Trees

All counties voted to continue this practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: See table on page 3.

Practice 5 - Woodland Improvement

All counties voted for the same practice as in 1965.

One county recommended that consideration be given to making a payment for the construction of logging roads instead of erosion control measures on logging roads - this for future years, not 1966.

Cost-share: See table on page 3.

Practice 6 - Obstruction Removal

13 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1965; one voted to limit cost-sharing to crawler-type equipment only.

Cost-share: See table on page 4.

Table of 1965 Rates with Recommendations for 1966
for Practices 4 and 5

County	Planting Trees		Woodland Improvement Cost-share (a)	
	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed
	1965	1966	1965	1966
Add.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Benn.	80% NTE \$25M	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Cal.	80% NTE \$25M ^{1/}	80% NTE \$25 M ^{1/}	70% NTE \$15 A ^{1/}	70% NTE \$15 A ^{1/}
Chitt.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$20 A
Essex	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Frank.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Gr. I.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$20 A
Lam.	80% NTE \$25M ^{2/}	80% NTE \$25 M ^{2/}	70% NTE \$15 A ^{2/}	70% NTE \$15 A ^{2/}
Ora.	\$25 M	\$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Orl.	70% NTE \$25M	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Rut..	\$25 M	\$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Wash.	70% NTE \$20M ^{3/}	70% NTE \$20 M ^{3/}	^{4/}	^{4/}
Windh.	70% NTE \$20M ^{5/}	70% NTE \$20 M ^{5/}	50% NTE \$12 A ^{5/}	50% NTE \$12 A ^{5/}
Winds.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A

^{1/} \$500 limit on forestry practices.

^{2/} 5 acres of forestry per farm.

^{3/} \$150 farm limit.

^{4/} 70% NTE \$15 A for thinning, removing, and killing and 50% NTE \$15 A for pruning, with a farm limit of \$300.

^{5/} 20 acre limit on forestry practices

4

Table of 1965 rates with recommendations for 1966
for Practice 6

County	<u>Obstruction removal</u>	
	Actual 1965	Proposed 1966
Add.	40% NTE \$25 A or \$150 farm	40% NTE \$25 A or \$150 farm
Benn.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)
Cal.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)
Chitt.	40% NTE \$15 A or \$75 farm	40% NTE \$15 A or \$75 farm
Essex	40% NTE \$20 A (\$120*)	40% NTE \$20 A (\$120*)
Frank.	40% NTE \$15 A (5A*)	40% NTE \$15 A (5A*)
Gr. I.	40% NTE \$25 A	40% NTE \$25 A
Lam.	40% NTE \$20 A or \$100 farm	40% NTE \$20 A or \$100 farm
Orange	40% NTE \$25 A (\$150*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$150*)
Orleans	40% NTE \$25 A or \$100 farm	40% NTE \$25 A or \$100 farm
Tut.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)	50% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)
Wash.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)
Windham	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)
Windsor	40% NTE \$25 A	40% NTE \$25 A

*Farm limit

Practice 7 - Stripcropping

13 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1965 and one county does not plan to offer it.

Cost-share:

13 counties voted for the same cost-share as in 1965.

Practice 8 - Farm Pond

12 counties voted for this practice as now offered; one voted that all ponds must be fenced; and one to include ponds for orchards, to fence or protect all ponds from stock, and to add a cost-share(c) of 50¢ a rod for 3-strand or woven wire fence.

Cost-share: See table on page 5.

Table of 1965 rates with recommendations for 1966
for Practice 8

County	<u>Farm Ponds</u>	
	Cost-share (a) Actual 1965	Cost-share (a) Proposed 1966
Addison	40%	40%
Bennington	40% (\$300* inc. seeding)	40% (\$300* inc. seeding)
Caledonia	40%	40%
Chittenden	40% NTE \$100 dug or \$300 dam	40% NTE \$100 dug or \$300 dam
Essex	40% 1/	40% 1/
Franklin	40% NTE \$60 dug &/or \$150 dam	40% NTE \$80 dug &/or \$150 dam
Grand Isle	40%	40%
Lamoille	40% NTE \$150	40% NTE \$150
Orange	40% 2/	40% 2/
Orleans	40% 3/	40% 3/
Rutland	40% (\$200*)	50% (\$200*)
Washington	40% 4/	40% 4/
Windham	40% (\$200*)	40% (\$200*)
Windsor	40% 5/	40% 5/

*Farm limit

- 1/ Owner must have had at least 10 animal units on the farm during the previous year.
- 2/ \$500 for pond for any one farm.
- 3/ \$200 for dug ponds, \$300 for impounded ponds including spreading the spoil.
- 4/ \$200 including required seeding, fencing, etc.
- 5/ \$500 and the farm must have been owned by applicant at least 3 years, using October 31 as cutoff date, and must carry out a practice this year or in prior 4 years.

Practice 9 - Sod waterways

All 14 counties voted for the same practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: All counties agreed to continue the present cost-share.

Practice 10 - Pipelines

12 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1965; one county recommended that pasture pumps be included; and one recommended including cow pumps.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one county for 40%, as in 1965.

Practice 11 - Diversion Ditch

All counties voted for this practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: All counties voted to continue the present cost-share.

Practice 12 - Channel Lining

All counties voted for this practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one for 40% as in 1965.

Practice 13 - Streambank Protection

All counties voted for the practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: Nine counties voted for a 50% cost-share for (a) and (b), with one setting a farm limit of \$300 for removing trees 12" and larger; 4 counties voted for 50% for (a) and \$3 a tree for (b); and one county voted for 50% for (a) and \$3 a tree 12-23" and \$4 a tree 24" and over. These cost-shares are the same as in 1965.

Practice 14 - Open Drainage

All 14 counties voted to continue the practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one for 40% as in 1965.

Practice 15 - Tile Drainage

All counties voted to continue this practice as now offered.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted to offer 50% of the cost and one voted for 40%.

Practice 16 - Land Grading

13 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1965, and one county voted to require the use of a land leveler in order to qualify for payment.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a cost-share of 50% of the cost with one of these setting a limit of \$25 an acre, and one county voted for 40%.

Practice 17 - Springs and Seeps

12 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1965. One voted to extend the practice to develop springs to meet new Federal regulations; and another voted to include cost-sharing for piping water to the barn for livestock drinking purposes.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a cost-share of 50% of the cost. One county voted for 50% for (a) and 40% for (b).

Practice 18 - Special Conservation Practices

One of the counties voted to work up a winter cover crop practice for land where the same crop is raised each year and present methods neither improve nor maintain the soil.

Practice 18(a) - Green Manure

Two counties offering this practice in 1965 voted to continue it in 1966. (Caledonia and Windham Counties)

Practice 18(b) - Mulching

One county offering this practice in 1965 voted to continue it in 1966. (Windham County)

Another county voted to offer it in 1966. (Addison County)

Practice 18(c) - Shrub Control

Two counties offering this practice in 1965 voted to continue it in 1966. (Chittenden and Windham Counties)

Practice 18(d) - Establishing New Seeding

One county voted to continue this "Special ACP Project" practice in 1966. (Orleans County)

Practice 18(e) - Improvement of Hay or Pasture

One county voted to continue this "Special ACP Project" practice in 1966 (Orleans County)

Practice 18(f) - Wild Tree Improvement

The five counties offering this practice in 1965 voted to continue it in 1966. (Caledonia, Essex, Lamoille, Orange and Orleans Counties)

Another county voted to offer this practice in 1966. (Washington County)

Practice 19 - County Conservation Practices

All counties voted to offer this provision.

Practice 19(a) - Super with Manure

All counties voted to offer this practice as in 1965.

Cost-share: See table on page 2.

Practice 20 - New Conservation Problems

All counties voted not to offer this provision.

Practice 21 - Emergency Conservation Measures

All counties voted not to offer this provision.

Practice 22 - Wildlife Practices

13 counties voted to offer this provision and one voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: Two counties set over-all per farm limits on wildlife practices of \$300 and \$500 respectively.

Practice 22(a) - Shallow Water Areas

Seven counties voted to continue this practice as in 1965; one voted to make the minimum area two acres; and six voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: Seven counties voted the same cost-share (a) of 50% with one setting a limit of \$300 on this practice. The remaining county voted to offer the same cost-share (a) of 40% not to exceed \$60 for a dug type and/or \$150 for a dam type.

Practice 22(b) - Ponds

Nine counties voted to offer this practice as in 1965; one county voted to continue the restriction that one other practice must be carried on the farm in order to be eligible for this practice; one county voted to continue a restriction that the farm must have been owned at least three years, using October 31 as a cutoff date, and must carry out a practice this year or in prior four years; one county continued a restriction that a farmer must have owned the land for three years as of July 1 and must carry out one additional practice; another county added a restriction that the farm must have been owned at least three years, the applicant must own at least 10 acres, and the pond must be at least 1/4 acre; and one county voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: All 13 counties voted for the same cost-share (a) of 40% as in 1965. One set a limit of \$150 on this practice; two, a limit of \$200; two, \$300; two, \$500; one, a limit of \$60 for a dug type and/or \$150 for a dam type; and one, a limit of \$200 for a dug type and \$300 for a dam type.

Practice 22(c) - Land Management

Five counties voted to offer this practice as in 1965 and 9 voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: All five counties voted for the same cost-share of 50% as in 1965, with one setting a limit of \$150 on this practice.

Practice 22(d) - Cutback Borders

Four counties voted to continue this practice as in 1965 and 10 voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: All four counties voted for the same cost-share of 50% as in 1965 and one of these continued the limit of \$100 a farm for this practice.

C. OPERATING POLICIES

1. What arrangements should be made for enrolling farmers in the program?

Twelve counties voted for farm-to-farm visits, one for farm-to-farm visits and year round at office for FS and SCS practices, and one voted for sign-up meetings.

2. What are your suggestions in connection with breaking down the use of program funds among farmers?

All fourteen counties recommended leaving this up to the county committee.

3. What are your suggestions on the use of 5% and 1% funds:

Four counties voted to continue as in 1965.

The remaining counties had no suggestions to make.

4. What minimum soil test requirements should we have before cost-share will be made for:

Lime? Seven counties agreed to continue the restrictions in effect in 1965, two do not require a test, and two will allow lime where needed. The remaining three counties commented as follows:

- a. 2 tons unless test shows otherwise.
- b. On basis of needs. Two tons unless test shows less is needed. Must be used on land treated with cost-shared fertilizer unless test shows pH of 6.2 or more.
- c. On basis of needs. Test to show 6.0 for topdressing and 6.5 for seeding with mixed fertilizer.

M.F. Six counties agreed to continue the present requirements. The remaining eight counties commented as follows:

- a. Must use lime or prove by test it is not needed.
- b. Must meet lime needs as in 1965 and use 2 tons lime unless test shows otherwise.
- c. Encourage test but do not require one.
- d. Use 1 ton of lime per acre of cost-shared mixed fertilizer or prove by test it is not needed.
- e. Use not approved unless lime was used the previous year or ordered in the current year or soil test shows lime is not needed. Minimum pH is 6.5.
- f. On new seeding - pH for lime to be used - no test when using 2 tons per acre; on hay or pasture - same as new seeding.
- g. Require 2 tons per acre unless test shows otherwise.
- h. Test to be made by recognized laboratory.

5. Conservation Materials and Services

- a. Should we continue to furnish conservation materials under contract in 1966 as we did in 1965?

All counties voted "Yes."

C. 5. a.	LIME	County	Size of Bag	Type of Delivery			
				Bagged F.Y.	Bagged Siding	Bulk- Spread	FOB Plant
		Addison	80	x		x	x
		Bennington	80	x		x	
		Caledonia	80	x	x	x	
		Chittenden	80	x		x	
		Essex	80	x		x	
		Franklin	100	x		x	
		Grand Isle	100	x		x	
		Lamoille	80		x	x	
		Orange	80	x	x	x	x
		Orleans	100	x	x	x	
		Rutland	80	x		x	x
		Washington	80	x		x	
		Windham		Purchase Order			
		Windsor	80	x		x	x

SUPER Type of Delivery - Ten counties voted for bagged siding; two counties voted for bagged farmyard; and one county voted for bagged farmyard and FOB plant delivery.

One county voted to leave decision on type of delivery to county committee based on best buy offered.

MIXED	County	0-15-30 or 0-25-25			Bagged Siding	Bagged F.Y.	FOB Plant	Bulk- spread
		0-25-25	0-25-25	0-15-30				
	Addison		x			x	x	
	Benn.		x		x			
	Cal.	<u>1/</u>				x	x	
	Chitt.		x		x	x	x <u>2/</u>	
	Essex	x				x	x	
	Franklin	x				x		
	Gr. I.			x		x	x	
	Lam.	<u>3/</u>			x			
	Orange	x <u>4/</u>			x	x		
	Orleans	<u>5/</u>				x	x	
	Rutland	<u>6/</u>						
	Washington	x				x	x	
	Windham	Purchase Order						
	Windsor			x <u>7/</u>	x			

1/ 0-10-30 with boron or 0-25-25.

2/ 0-15-30 only.

3/ Will decide on kind after bids are opened; also wish bids on granular material.

4/ 0-15-30 and 0-25-25; wish bids for both siding and FOB.

5/ 0-15-30 and 0-25-25.

6/ Will decide kind and type of delivery based on best buy offered.

7/ Including borax.

- C. 5. b. Purchase Order Plan - Indicate the type of material or service to be furnished under this plan:

<u>Kind of Service</u>	<u>Reply</u>	<u>No. Counties</u>
(1) Planting forest trees	Yes No	13 1
(2) Woodland improvement	Yes No	14 0
(3) Earth moving	Yes No	14 0
(4) Other: Fertilizer		1 (Orange)
Lime and Mixed Fertilizer		1 (Windham)

- c. Should we continue the soil sampling service?

Yes 12 No 1 No answer 1

The following comments were made:

- (1) Use quick test kits.
- (2) Use quick test by committeemen and complete test where requested.
- (3) Community committeemen test when requested; tell farmer to contact county agent for complete test.

9. OTHER SUGGESTIONS

Seven counties made the following suggestions:

1. Include orchard in cropland.
2. Schedule future program planning meetings in January or February, preferably February.
3. Establish a new practice for cow pumps to be used in existing sources of water such as wells and lakes.
4. Cost-share water supplies to comply with the Dairy Sanitation Code at 50%.
5. The State Committee should study the feasibility of allowing a driven well to be substituted for a farm pond when SCS recommends this as a better means of obtaining livestock water.
6. Amend the National Handbook to allow any State to pay up to 70% of the cost-share of lime, looking forward to 1967.
7. Print leaflet with space for practices requested, amount due, and payment deadlines for CMS.

Hold a tour outside the county not later than June 10.

Three counties commented concerning the drought situation:

1. One county requested emergency ACF funds.
2. One county requested emergency funds for reseeding, trees, ponds, pipelines, and spring development in the disaster area.
3. Another county requested emergency funds for reseeding, replanting, developing springs and seeps, ponds, and pipelines.

Some Facts on the Conservation Reserve Program*

Contracts in Force

We currently have 790 contracts in force on 27,053 acres of land.
24,127 of this is in whole farms and 906 in part farms.

Annual payments amounted to \$367,235 in 1964 for an average of \$13.57 per acre.

Acreage Under Contract by Years

<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>
1956	465	1960	32523	1964	27884	1968	24272
1957	1998	1961	32660	1965	25033	1969	14423
1958	6101	1962	32310	1966	24868	1970	6760
1959	25286	1963	31593	1967	24587	1971	79

Practices Carried Out (Through 1962 program)

<u>Practice</u>	<u>Extent</u>
Seeding grass and legumes	31 Acres
Tree planting	12660 Acres
Ponds	19 Ponds

*Presented at 1965 State ASCS Conference by A. F. Heald

A Report on the Current Livestock Feed Program

The Cause

Continued drought in southern Vermont has made it impossible for farmers to produce sufficient roughage on their own farms to carry their livestock. Good quality hay has been very high priced.

Because of the above conditions, the County Disaster Committees in Bennington, Orange, Rutland, Windham and Windsor Counties requested that a Livestock Feed Program be authorized in their counties.

The State Disaster Committee met and discussed the problem on August 31, 1964, and approved the county requests.

These requests were reviewed with Governor Hoff who concurred in the need for the program and recommended such program to the Secretary of Agriculture. Approval was received from the Department on September 9, 1964.

The Results

Arrangements were made to ship corn and oats into the area. This year for the first time a new warrant program was inaugurated. This provided that any dealer who would sign an agreement with the county committee was eligible to sell approved grain mixtures to farmers in the county involved.

A pooling arrangement was also worked out. Under this system, the Vermont State Office entered into agreements with Crosby Milling Co., Ralston Purina Co., St. Albans Grain Co. and H. K. Webster Co. to handle corn and oats. These companies received the corn and/or oats at their facilities, ground and bagged the grain and reshipped it to destinations as directed by the State Office. The pooling arrangement was expanded beyond Vermont counties so that our State Office also serviced Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut.

Our records indicate the following sales to date in Vermont:

Corn - 206,773 bushels (approx. 103 cars)
Oats - 166,766 bushels (approx. 72 cars)

Under the pooling system, the following amounts of corn and oats have been handled in Vermont and the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut: 163 cars of corn (approx. 326,000 bushels) and 181 cars of oats (approx. 416,300 bushels).

As of April 13, 1965, there was a total of 33 states participating in the Livestock Feed Program and 689 counties. Farmer purchases of feed grain under this program amounted to approximately 43,000,000 bushels.

Termination

State and County Disaster Committees have requested a 30-day extension of the program in Vermont. As of this writing, this has not been approved. This means that, unless the 30-day extension is granted, the final date for

a farmer to request grain under this program in Vermont will be April 23. County offices will not issue delivery orders or warrants after May 14 and the farmer must have picked up and fed the grain to his livestock by May 31.

COUNTY INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

Discussion led by Richard A. Moore,
Chairman, State ASC Committee

Mr. Moore led a discussion of the paper entitled "Some Suggestions for County Informational Meetings" which was distributed to the group.

After a thorough review of these suggestions, it was concluded that county personnel should take the list home, study it, recommend to the State Office on or before May 10 what kind of informational meeting each county wants.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR COUNTY INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS *

1. A study of special land use practices at the county level; for example, the practice for improving land use in former pasture areas.

This could be in the form of a discussion of the practice in the forenoon and a visit to farms in the afternoon.

2. Suggestions to Committeemen for making a good farm visit.

This could be a talk in the morning with suggestions from county agents and county committeemen, and a sample farm visit in the afternoon.

3. Making good use of wildlife practices.

This could be in the form of a discussion in the morning and a visit to selected farms illustrating the practice in the afternoon. If possible, local Fish and Game Club representatives should be invited in to the meeting.

4. A meeting on the theme of "What We Are Doing for Your Community."

This could be a joint farmer-businessman session to review ACP accomplishments in the county.

5. New programs affecting rural landowners.

A survey of the many new programs which would include some or all of the following -- RAD, RC&D, FHA, Rural Civil Defense, State Planning, Land and Water Fund Conservation, PL 566, etc. These could be handled by one man or by a panel.

6. Soil testing.

Win Way or Jerry McIntosh could bring the committeemen up to date on the recently changed laboratory procedures and testing and some of the details relative to the prescription writing concept, as well as the new types of fertilizer material handling and mixing.

7. State planning.

Its effect on the future of land and water use in Vermont. Someone from the Central Planning Office, such as Richard RuBino.

8. USDA programs.

Jim Wood of the Rural Community Development Service could mention some of the programs with which he is involved, and a report of the family farm project which is being handled by Charles Rising.

9. Water resources.

The problem of cleaning up Vermont streams seems to have stepped up and the primary responsibility lies with the Department of Water Resources. Individual landowners will have responsibilities here and perhaps Bud Thieme would be a man here.

10. Forest management possibilities.

Ray Foulds has been working in this field and there are several new research studies that could be interpreted in terms of individual responsibilities and possibilities.

11. Farm management.

Dairying in 1975, with Dwight Eddy and other specialists.

OTHER CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

Conference Banquet

The banquet speaker this year was Charles M. Cox, Assistant Deputy Administrator, State and County Operations, ASCS, who reminded the group that there are constant changes in agriculture and the farm programs, and challenged them to do their best in continuing the present high standards of administration and service to farmers in this State.

The toastmaster was Edson E. Gifford, Sr. who served on the State Committee from 1957 to 1961. Mr. Gifford, in his genial and able manner, held everyone's interest and guided the evening's program to a successful conclusion.

Others at the head table included:

John L. Daley, Lieutenant Governor of Vermont
Mrs. Edson E. Gifford, Sr.
Paul R. Miller, Dean, College of Agriculture, UVM
Robert P. Davison, Director of Extension and Ex Officio
Member of State ASC Committee, and Mrs. Davison
Raymond G. Rowley, Commissioner of Agriculture, and Mrs. Rowley
John Vance, Director, Conservation and Land Use Division, ASCS
Gardner Smith, Staff Assistant, Northeast Area, ASCS
Richard A. Moore, Chairman, State ASC Committee, and Mrs. Moore
Morris E. LaFrance, State ASC Committeeman, and Mrs. LaFrance
J. Paul Bonneau, State ASC Committeeman

The group was honored that Lieutenant Governor Daley could be present and enjoyed the brief talk he gave on conservation work and agricultural problems in the State.

Special guests at the banquet were Miss Claire Ruegg, an American Field Service student from Switzerland now attending South Burlington High School, and her faculty adviser, Mrs. Dorothy Carreau. Miss Ruegg entertained the group by singing folk songs in several different languages, and then gave a short talk on life in Switzerland and her impressions of the United States. Everyone was captivated by her charm and lovely voice, and the group responded with a rising vote of thanks for the delightful presentation.

The presence of 133 at the banquet this year made this the best attended so far. The Hotel Vermont staff served their justly famous London Broil which was greatly enjoyed. At the close of the program the flowers from the head table were presented to Mrs. Moore in appreciation of her serving as conference hostess.

ASCS Alumni

A special table at the banquet was reserved for State ASCS alumni and their wives. Those present this year were:

Mr. and Mrs. Howard A. Foster, Salisbury)	
Mr. and Mrs. Park H. Newton, St. Albans)	
Mr. and Mrs. L. Earl Wilson, Craftsbury)	State Committee
Hugh E. Evans and daughter Kathy, Brattleboro)	

Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Doane, So. Burlington)	State Office Staff
---	---	--------------------

Visitors from Cooperating Offices

We were pleased that the following representatives of cooperating agencies could attend sessions of the conference:

R. D. Aplin, Milk Marketing Administrator, Boston
 Richard Angney, Farmers Home Administration, Montpelier
 Merton Ashton, Deputy Director, Selective Service System, Montpelier
 Robert Douglas, Swanton Lime Works Inc., Swanton
 Marshall Dunham, Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Montpelier
 George Dykhuizen, Professor of Philosophy, UVM and former USDA
 Consultant, Burlington
 Raymond Foulds, Extension Forester, Burlington
 George Fowler, Farmers Home Administration, Montpelier
 Lawrence Franklin, Chairman, House Agricultural Committee, Montpelier
 Robert Graf, Director, National Association of SCD, Pawlet
 David Grimwood, Soil Conservation Service, Burlington
 Paul Guare, State Office, Economic Opportunity Act, Montpelier
 Richard Holmes, Deputy Director, Civil Defense, Montpelier
 John Lindsay, Outdoor Recreation Specialist, UVM
 Tom McCormick, Assistant Extension Editor, Burlington
 Jerry McIntosh, Extension Soil-Plant Relationship Specialist, Burlington
 Richard Macomber, Coordinator of Resources, Central Planning Office,
 Montpelier
 S. M. Martinetti, Farm Placement Supervisor, Department of
 Employment Security, Montpelier
 L. J. Peet, State Conservationist, SCS, Burlington
 William Stone, County Agent Leader, Burlington
 Noah Thompson, Rural Defense Information Specialist, Burlington

Length-of-Service Awards

Certificates and pins recognizing the years of service rendered were presented to the following county personnel:

County Committeemen

15 Years	D. Drew Bisbee, Washington County
10 Years	Jay J. Haylett, Grand Isle County
	Ray C. Perkins, Lamoille County
	Matthew H. Watson, Windsor County

County Office Managers

20 Years	Marjorie E. Leith, Washington County
15 Years	Edla S. Browne, Addison County

County Office General Clerks

10 Years	Beryl C. Pembroke, Washington County
----------	--------------------------------------

Certificate and Memory Book

Mr. Heald announced to the group that Paul R. Miller, Dean of the College of Agriculture, plans to retire at the end of this fiscal year. The State Committee prepared for him a certificate expressing appreciation for his long years of service to agriculture and mounted this certificate in a memory book containing a collection of pictures and documents commemorating events over the years. Mr. Heald briefly reviewed the pictures starting with Mr. Miller's first work with our organization back in the 1930's and showing his continued interest and cooperation right up to the present. The memory book was then presented to Mr. Miller with the best wishes of the group for his retirement.

Retired Fieldman

Mr. Heald reminded those present that a few weeks before Charles B. Doane had retired from the State Office staff where he had served as fieldman for many years. At the time of his retirement there were no plans for a State Conference in the near future, so the State Committee held a luncheon for Mr. Doane and, on behalf of the county committeemen and office managers, presented him with a television set and a purse of money.

Mr. Doane took this opportunity to thank the group for the gifts and to tell them that he had enjoyed the years when he was working with them but had discovered that a retired person could be filled with mixed emotions. He is glad of the leisure time which permits him to take on projects long postponed, but he misses the long-time association with co-workers. Mr. Doane closed his remarks by saying that of all the conferences he had attended, he was enjoying this one the most where he was a spectator and not a participant.

Afternoon Tea

During the afternoon of the first day of the conference, Mrs. Heald entertained the wives attending the conference at afternoon tea at her home. Mrs. Richard Moore, wife of the State Committee Chairman, assisted by Mrs. Morris LaFrance, wife of a State Committee member, served as conference hostess and greeted the ladies on their arrival. She made arrangements for transportation and the ladies enjoyed a pleasant afternoon together.

Publicity

Throughout the conference photographers and local newsmen took pictures and interviewed speakers and guests. The local TV station used some of the pictures as a part of the day's local news and excellent coverage was provided by the local newspaper. Tapes were provided to Vermont radio stations immediately following the conference so that coverage was provided to all corners of Vermont. We are indebted to Tom McCormick of the Vermont Extension Service Information Office, and to Stephen Wade of the ASCS Northeast Area Office, for their excellent work in obtaining this coverage for us.

Exhibits

The general sessions of the conference were held in the Roof Garden where many charts and pictures of ASCS projects and accomplishments were on display. Included were two posters of colored pictures depicting various aspects of ASCS programs. The exhibits proved very interesting to those attending and were used by several of the speakers as reference material.

